
This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

<https://books.google.com>





LIBRARY
OF THE
Rev. JOHN WRIGHT, D.D.

No.

EGYPT'S RECORD OF TIME

TO THE

EXODUS OF ISRAEL.

RIVINGTONS

London	<i>Waterloo Place</i>
Oxford	<i>High Street</i>
Cambridge	<i>Trinity Street</i>

EGYPT'S RECORD OF TIME

TO THE

EXODUS OF ISRAEL,

Critically investigated:

WITH A COMPARATIVE SURVEY OF THE PATRIARCHAL HISTORY
AND THE CHRONOLOGY OF SCRIPTURE; RESULTING IN
THE RECONCILIATION OF THE SEPTUAGINT
AND HEBREW COMPUTATIONS, AND
MANETHO WITH BOTH.

By W. B. GALLOWAY, M.A.

VICAR OF ST. MARK'S, REGENT'S PARK,
AND CHAPLAIN TO THE EIGHT HON. LORD VISCOUNT HAWARDEN.

RIVINGTONS,
London, Oxford, and Cambridge.
1869.

In Memory
OF THE RIGHT HONOURABLE AND MOST REVEREND

C. T. LONGLEY, D.D.,

**LATE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY
AND PRIMATE OF ALL ENGLAND,**

WHO WHILE LIVING
DEIGNED TO HONOUR WITH HIS APPROVAL
THE AUTHOR'S PRESENT UNDERTAKING
IN DEFENCE OF HOLY SCRIPTURE,
AND GAVE PERMISSION TO INSCRIBE IT TO HIM,
NOW,
WITH AFFECTIONATE REGRET
FOR THE LOSS OF ONE SO REVERED AND BELOVED
(TOO LATE, ALAS, FOR HIS EYE,
BUT WITH CARE AND DILIGENCE COMPLETED),
TO THE

LIVING LORD AND SAVIOUR,
INTO WHOSE NEARER PRESENCE CALLED
IN RIPENESS OF CHARACTER
HE DEPARTED WITH TRANQUIL HOPE,—

To Jesus Christ

THE CHIEF SHEPHERD AND BISHOP,
SOLE PRINCE AND PONTIFF OF THE CHURCH,
KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS,
THIS WORK
IS HUMBLY DEDICATED:
OF WHOSE GRACE AND CONDESCENSION
MAY IT BE ACCEPTED AND BLESSED!

A PRELIMINARY EPISTLE.

*To the Remnant of Judah and Israel resident in
England.*

MEN OF ISRAEL,

The Lord's dealings with your fathers down to the time of His glorious deliverance of your nation out of Egypt are briefly considered in this work, and the historical truth of the Sacred Record is vindicated from some attempts of modern unbelievers. The subject specially concerns you, and while it is of interest for all, to you I specially commend it. Receive it, I pray you, in faith of that greater and more glorious deliverance which yet awaits you out of all lands into which your people have been scattered, and that glorious reconstitution of Israel under the Messiah, which is promised according to the word of the Lord. The appointed measure of time is fulfilled. The times of the Gentiles have run their course. Intreat the Lord that now at length He may have mercy, and be favourable to His ancient people; and do you, on your part, break off your sin and unbelief, that these may not frustrate His gracious and declared purpose towards you.

Though you have not recognized your King, yet as a conqueror He hath subdued the world, and that not by your swords, but by the word which proceedeth out of His mouth, and by the Divine grace and majesty of His person and character. He hath made your prophets honoured in every land. The law of the Ten Commandments, delivered to your fathers upon Mount Sinai, has through Him been placed at the basis of the law of England. The reflected lustre of His person upon those related to Him, and upon your race, has even so dazzled many, that it has been remarked not without ground by one of your own nation that one half of Europe worships a Jewess as queen of heaven. But that extravagant and idolatrous homage into which the children of idolators have fallen, while it affords a proof of how the house of David has been exalted in their eyes, receives no countenance from the teaching of your Messiah. As for us, we worship not man, but God. Even in your Messiah, the Saviour of the world, we worship not man, but God manifested in and by Him, as in the living Head of His believing people, as in the living ark of His presence having the Shekinah of His glory, as in the living temple of His indwelling in true human nature, through whom He is united to us also. For God doth not dwell apart from the world which He hath created, but in communication with man. Nor is the glorious unity of the Divine Being a barren and unfruitful unity, like that possessed only by the first numeral cypher, but most fruitful, forming the bond of unity to His people, and binding us together in one body, one living temple, He dwelling in us and we in Him. We may expect therefore that in His own Divine Being there is to be found the *ultima ratio* of that unity in

plurality, of which the practical manifestation is found abundantly in the creation, and even in each of us, whose life is complex yet one. A deep and awful mystery is God, whose very Name is not lightly to be pronounced. And most highly is that principle manifested in Him who is the only begotten Son, the Head of the redeemed, and the Centre of our spiritual life. For we recognize in Jesus, whom your fathers rejected and crucified, the true Son of David, your true King ; and in Him we accept your King as ours. Thus, though crucified by your ancestors, He is the Conqueror of the world ; for God raised Him from the dead and exalted Him to His right hand. These conquests are a testimony to you that He liveth ; proofs of living energy, and of Divine power and grace. By Him your Scriptures have been made to us as household words, and the ancient annals of your race are lisped even by our children. What conqueror ever so subdued mankind ? And shall He continue to be rejected and despised by you, His own countrymen and lawful subjects ?

In His name I invite you to lay aside old prejudices and to consider these things ; that when He appears in glory, and when His Divine power is about to be put forth for your deliverance and national reconstitution, you reject Him not again, nor prefer again some vain pretender, a Barabbas or some false Messiah, in His place. I here commend to you, not only the vindication of some parts of your ancient history against modern unbelief, but also demonstrable evidence that some grounds of your own unbelief in the Lord Jesus, as far as these depend on the chronology which your Rabbis hold, fail, and much need your reconsideration.

As a servant of your King, bound to you by the

ties of His love, I address you as still heirs of the promises made of God unto the fathers, in confidence that when the veil is removed from your hearts, a glorious destiny awaits you, a destiny of high place and honour for God's service, and of blessing to the world. Even to the Christian Church, now too extensively corrupted and debased, your return to duty to your own true Messiah is predicted to be "as life from the dead."

Let me hail you as brethren ! The promise made to Abraham that he should be "a father of many nations," and that "in him all kindreds of the earth should be blessed," has been verified in Abraham's Seed your glorious Messiah, given not to be yours exclusively, but also, as your prophets foretold, "a light to the Gentiles, that He might be God's salvation unto the ends of the earth." The exclusiveness of the old dispensation has been long broken down, and that by your national act. For consider what consequences are involved in a national act of regicide. In the person of the rightful king the law and constitution are represented. He, of right, is the law's executive power. Thus the Lord's Anointed, your King, represented in His person your law and constitution ; and, by the regicidal act of your ancestors, the national law and constitution, were in His person taken and nailed to the cross. The moral and spiritual principles of the law continued: but its executive, together with the penalties by which it was nationally enforced, were disannulled and taken away, and rendered dead letter. This is not the only nor the principal aspect of the death of the Messiah : He died as King, the representative of all His people, as the Son of Man, the representative of mankind, making by His death an atonement

and sacrifice on behalf of all ; and the results of His crucifixion have fulfilled and are fulfilling His prediction, “ I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me.” But the aspect of it which I have presented is one which peculiarly affects you nationally, and has an important bearing on your law. By the resurrection of Christ, your King, its moral and spiritual principles were sustained and revived in their preceptive obligation ; but it was not revived in its condemning power and penalty, or in its exclusive national force and privilege, or in the enactments subservient to these. Has not history substantiated this fact ? And can you complain of it ? But yet the gifts and calling of God are without repentance on His part. He is not unmindful of His covenant with your fathers. Though the door of grace is no longer closed against any, yet to you, who are Abraham’s by natural descent, some promises are special. May the Lord graciously confirm these to you, and qualify you by repentance and faith to be speedily made partakers of them ! The land of your fathers, promised of old to Abraham and his posterity, has that guarantee from God of your eventual possession ; and amid the tottering of the Mohammedan power, and the rival ambitions of earthly potentates, that solution in part awaits the questions of the east, to be sought not by violence, but from the Word of God, and from the agreement of Christians, to fix a barrier thereby to mutual encroachments, and to cause to inherit the waste heritages, to repair the desolations of many generations.

And you at least have not forgotten that God concerns Himself not merely with men individually, but with the nation. Human society cannot be a mere congeries of independent units, like a rope of sand.

Nations have their corporate duties and responsibilities ; and government, to be a blessing to mankind, must be from above, not from beneath. Government is for the administration of justice and truth ; and the mere popular will can neither make nor unmake one particle of truth or justice. It is a lie against the living and Almighty God, to say that the people are the source of all legitimate power. For the blessing of mankind, what is to be desired is not “the rule of the least competent.”

THE MORAL, THE SPIRITUAL, THE DIVINE IN MAN MUST RULE ; not the numerical force of the mere physical and arbitrary, not cunning craftiness and selfish scheming, or the volubility of the reckless and empirical, and of such as despise even the oath of the Lord. Mammon too has had his day of disastrous rule, and is found wanting. There are other principles worthy to be taken account of besides those of the wealth of nations. LET IT BE KNOWN AND PROCLAIMED THAT THE LORD GOD OMNIPOTENT REIGNETH ! The hour is on the wing when that proclamation will be accepted not as mere breath ; and when it will be felt and confessed that no other kingdom is henceforth possible to be established and to endure upon this earth, but THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

As a humble servant and messenger of the Lord JESUS CHRIST, I do hereby proclaim Him KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS, SUPREME IN THE STATE AS WELL AS IN THE CHURCH, and thereto have set, with my hand, my heart’s inmost prayer.

In faith of His coming glory,
I am, Men and Brethren,
Your Servant for His sake,
W. B. GALLOWAY.

Feb. 9, 1869.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

	PAGES
Nature and importance of the question to be considered ; with notice of the leading sources of information and misinformation as to the Manethonian Chronology of Egypt	1—33

CHAPTER I.

A Chronological statement of Dicæarchus considered	34—43
--	-------

CHAPTER II.

Of the Egyptian Mythical Periods of Diodorus ; their source demonstrated, with a view to the disentangling of that which is historical	44—66
--	-------

CHAPTER III.

Of the Egyptian Historical Periods of Diodorus. The account given by him of the fifty-two descendants of Menès, who reigned upwards of 1400 years	67—97
---	-------

CHAPTER IV.

The General Scheme of Manetho's Chronology restored, from his own statement	98—135
---	--------

CHAPTER V.

Examination and confutation of objections, resulting in additional evidence	136—174
---	---------

CHAPTER VI.

	PAGES
Traces of the progressive corruption of the Manethonian Chronology ; to which is added a Conspectus of the fabricated succession of early dynasties, self-demonstrative that they are not successive	175—209

CHAPTER VII.

A Catalogue of Egyptian kings in their order digested from the data of Manetho, Eratosthenes, Diodorus, and Eusebius, analyzed and restored, as compared with other ancient evidence. Part I. To the close of the Shepherd Dynasty .	210—236
--	---------

CHAPTER VIII.

A calculation of the date of the legalized introduction of the Egyptian year of 365 days, together with its Sothic Cycle, by the retrogression of the Thoth, with collateral evidence; affording an approximate demonstration of the date of the Golden Circle of Sesostris or Osymandyas, and of the birth of that monarch	237—283
---	---------

CHAPTER IX.

A Catalogue of Egyptian kings in their order, resumed. Part II. From the Expulsion of the Shepherd Dynasty to the Exodus of Israel	284—341
--	---------

CHAPTER X.

Section I. General observations on the preceding Catalogue, including a Tabulated view of the results deducible from Manetho's Chronology, having the leading Scriptural events inserted, in correspondence with the same date of the Exodus; the whole tested by the application of the Sabbatical and Jubilean systems, and by a direct Scriptural measurement; and finally issuing in the exact reconciliation of the Hebrew and Septuagint Chronology, and Manetho with both	342—401
Section II. The true date of the birth of the Lord Jesus Christ investigated, with a view to determine the continuity of the Christian with the patriarchal ages as above exhibited	401—430

CHAPTER XI.

	PAGES
A General review of the relation which the ancient Egyptian Chronology above examined bears to the sacred history; with a tabulated view of Chronology in the family of Jacob	431—508

CHAPTER XII.

Of the route taken by the Israelites out of Egypt; their numbers; their cattle and flocks: in correction of the unscriptural misstatements respecting these, of which late objectors have made use	509—530
--	---------

APPENDIX.

NOTE A.

On the variations of names and numbers	531—545
--	---------

NOTE B.

Of the title Souchis, Zôuphis, or Sophi	545—548
---	---------

NOTE C.

Of the ancestors and successor of Sesostris. The expeditions and conquests of his father	548—553
--	---------

NOTE D.

Serapion's interpretation of the Inscription on the Obelisk of Rhamestes brought to Rome by the Emperor Constantius, translated from the Greek preserved by Ammianus Marcellinus; and a passage from Tacitus referring to the same king	553—556
---	---------

NOTE E.

	PAGES
Passages from Diodorus, Books xxxiv. and xl.	556—562

NOTE F.

Notice of some untenable conjectures as to the star of Christ's nativity	562—570
--	---------

ERRATUM.

Page 18, lines 15, 16, *for* were unknown to Timæus, the Scholiast on Plato; *read* were unknown to the Scholiast on Plato's Timæus;

N.B.—There is a Greek Sophist, a lexicographer to Plato, of that name, whose work is published in the same Appendix, but who is thought to be of rather earlier date.

INTRODUCTION.

NATURE AND IMPORTANCE OF THE QUESTION TO BE CONSIDERED ; WITH NOTICE OF THE LEADING SOURCES OF INFORMATION AND MISINFORMATION AS TO THE MANETHONIAN CHRONOLOGY OF EGYPT.

THE interest of a question relating to the early history and development of mankind, while it is considerable in itself, is enhanced when it involves results, not only of antiquarian curiosity, but of immediate concern to the present and future well-being of man. And in regard to the subject of the following pages, that is peculiarly the case, since it stands connected with the credit to be given to the sacred history, and with the consequent stability or instability of faith.

On this ground, indeed, the investigation of the subject here undertaken has become highly necessary. The infidelity which in the present day is sapping the foundations of religion, and diminishing the confidence even of many professed believers in the truth of the Holy Scriptures, is such as cannot be turned aside by arguments of a general and popular description, nor stopped by authoritative decision. It proceeds upon learned and critical grounds, and can be satisfactorily dealt with only by thorough and searching investigation. That

treatment of it may not indeed be adapted to the taste which inclines towards whatever requires least effort of thought, and cares only for Christianity made easy: but the most practical and popular zeal is not independent of the solidity and accuracy of knowledge in the truth; and even the most simple-minded piety may now occasionally pause, to ask with the prophet, "O my Lord, what shall the end of these things be?" We may be energetically promoting good works, building churches, extending the offices of religion; but in the mean while it is becoming a more and more serious inquiry, by whom, in a few years, these churches shall be occupied; what the doctrines taught in them; and what the faith of the worshippers. The silent progress of an assuming criticism is tincturing some of the future clergy and educated laity with doubt or infidelity; while, on the other hand, there are those who are disposed to see no refuge from infidelity, except in submission to the Papal pretence of infallibility,—which is but another and more organized form of the same thing, amounting, in the end, to the opinion that truth is nothing in itself, but can be made or unmade at the dictum of the Pope. With the experience before us of long ages of miserable error and delusion, we dare not indolently trust the truth to take care of itself, without attention and duty on our part; and in various departments of it zealous and able writers have accordingly stood forward to meet the growing scepticism; but their learned labours have left much to be accomplished, and most of all in the range of subject which is here taken up.

The deadliest form of infidel attack which has yet arisen is that which is based on the union of

German rationalistic criticism with Egyptological studies. By this an attempt is made to overthrow the Scripture history, and to fix upon it a demonstration of its falsity, from the parallel history and monuments of Egypt. It is not negative, but positive, laboriously occupied in the endeavour to establish a contrary truth. Against this any mere general invective were altogether out of place. It may be that there are many earnest and sincere minds entangled in the difficulties of the subject; and as the doubts of the Apostle Thomas were permitted and overruled for the more confirmation of our faith, it need not be questioned that a similar result will be ordained by the Divine Providence from the present scepticism. Let it not be dealt with in an unkindly spirit, but with a just conformity to the spirit of the Collect used on St. Thomas's Day.

Recent hieroglyphical and monumental pretensions in support of a chronology irreconcilably at variance with Scripture resolve themselves chiefly into Dr. Lepsius and the fabricated pseudo-Manethonian succession of dynasties. As this is desirable to be generally known, in order to a full perception of the importance of the subject of investigation in the present work, it is proper that the fact should appear as one generally accepted, and especially so by the Egyptologists. Now the general acceptance of Dr. Lepsius by the scientific as an authority in this department is well known, and he has maintained that position for some time. "All that relates to Egyptian chronology and history," says Baron Humboldt in his "Cosmos," "and which is distinguished in the text by marks of quotation, is based on manuscript communications which I re-

ceived from my friend Professor Lepsius, in March, 1846¹.” But the special acceptance of the same authority by the Egyptologists is of importance to our argument. For this reason, the words of one of the most advanced of them, with whom I had some personal acquaintance, long resident as American Consul at Cairo, and known as the author of several learned works in this department, may here be cited; and the rather because the opinions of Dr. Lepsius, coupled with the opportunities of his correspondence, seem to have exercised that disastrous influence upon the faith of my former friend which is but too apparent between his earlier² and later works; an influence which followed him, it is feared, to his grave, and which I allude to with sorrow and with tenderness.

“ So various and unforeseen,” says the late Mr. Gliddon, “ were the victorious achievements effected in the year 1843 by the Prussian Scientific Mission among the pyramids from Memphis to the Labyrinth, so completely have they revolutionized all preceding judgments upon Nilotic antiquity, that we must pause to indicate how they originated, and where they are to be found.

“ Chevalier Richard Lepsius, long celebrated as

¹ “Cosmos,” vol. ii. part ii. sect. 2, *Principal Momenta, &c., note.*

² In 1843 Mr. Gliddon wrote, “ The Septuagint Version, and the venerable array of orthodox Churchmen who support the latter’s computation, permit us to place the deluge somewhere about 3200 B.C. By which arrangement we attain a period of thirty-two centuries, and one that gives us ‘ ample room and verge enough’ to reconstruct the history of ancient Egypt, founded upon the results of hieroglyphical interpretations, and corroborated by authorities sacred and profane.” *Ancient Egypt: a Series of Chapters on Early Egyptian History, Archaeology, &c.* New York, 1843, p. 37.

Corresponding Secretary of the *Institute of Archœological Correspondence* at Rome, directed his studies into Egyptology soon after the publication of a prize essay, that placed him in the front rank of linguistical scholarship, in 1834. A *Lettre à M. le Prof. Hippolyte Rosellini, sur l'Alphabet Hiéroglyphique*, 1837, next announced to the world of science that the loss of the illustrious Champollion had but momentarily arrested the onward march of his disciples. The return of Perring from Egypt, after his indefatigable exploration of thirty-nine pyramids, rendered the fact generally known, that, immense as had been his own successes, the Necropolis of Memphis had, notwithstanding, scarcely begun to yield up its historical treasures. French and Tuscan national, with English private enterprise, had been rewarded in the valley of the Nile by victories over past time as noble as they were scientific. It remained for Frederick William IV. of Prussia to give full scope to the hitherto pent-up yearnings of Germany towards Egyptian discovery; and upon Lepsius, in 1842, naturally fell the mantles of his predecessors³."

Similar testimony may abundantly be found in the Chevalier Bunsen's work on Egypt, and a similarly disastrous influence, though not to an equal degree, appears to have been gradually produced on his faith.

The Bunsen of "Egypt's Place in Universal History" is no longer of quite the same genial though speculative spirit which meets us in his earlier works. Between him and Lepsius, no doubt, the speculative

³ "Types of Mankind; or, Ethnological Researches." By J. C. Nott, M.D., and Geo. R. Gliddon. Philadelphia, 1855, p. 673.

influence must have been reciprocal ; but so far as concerns the attempt to fasten those speculations upon the monuments of Egypt, Lepsius is the authority. "Champollion and Rosellini's restorations," Bunsen tells us, "were manifestly quite wrong."

Let us, then, advert to Dr. Lepsius's own testimony. "In spite of numerous writings upon Egyptian Mythology," says he, "it has nevertheless been hitherto deficient in a fixed monumental basis. In the Temple at Thebes we beheld a series of representations whose meaning had not hitherto been recognized, and which seem to me to afford *entirely new conclusions* for the correct comprehension and development of Egyptian Mythology. The series of the first arrangement of the gods mentioned by Herodotus and Manetho, which in modern investigations has been differently arranged in its details by all scholars, is at length placed beyond all doubt, and certainly differs in all essential points from what has been hitherto every where adopted" (p. 27).

In regard to increased chronological knowledge obtained concerning the monuments, he says, "For the first time we were able to pursue all its branches during the old Egyptian monarchy, previous to the invasion of the Hycsos, and accordingly to extend both it, and the history of Egypt, about sixteen centuries further back, and some tens of years lower down in time" (p. 28).

All the alleged monumental evidence to the elongated chronology, which he follows, is therefore confessed to depend on Dr. Lepsius's interpretations of the inscriptions ; and, as it is not in our province to deal with the details of hieroglyphical interpreta-

⁴ "Egypt's Place in Universal History," vol. ii. p. 539.

tion, we must take its value partly according to what we observe of his fairness or unfairness in the treatment of such evidence as all can judge of⁵; and partly according to his own account of the new monumental light which he had obtained. Respecting the latter, the following is his statement:—

“With the exception of a few individual points, my restoration,” says he, “of the Manethonic Chronology was principally determined *before* my journey to Egypt.” Place this in connexion with what he says again: “We therefore believe that by *a new path, namely, the Manethonic Chronology, we have found the key to the relative portions of time in the Old Testament, so far as these are connected with Egypt*; and in an inverse manner we may now consider the agreement that subsists between the chronology of the Hebrew history (both the true chronology represented in the genealogies, and the false one which was afterwards erroneously adopted), and the Egyptian numbers upon which the chronology was originally founded, to be indeed strongly confirmatory of the authenticity of these last as they appear according to our restoration of them” (p. 490).

Here then we have the *key* to those remarkable discoveries of his in Chronology. The monuments of Egypt are made to speak Dr. Lepsius’s supposed restoration of Manetho’s dynasties, which he had framed before he set foot on the Egyptian shore. Voiceless, mysterious, and awful, amid the sublime silence of the deserted ruins, yet at the wand of the enchanter they lift up their voice, and give solemn utterance to the stupendous and magnificent pseudo-

⁵ Note E at the end of this volume.

myth of the three thousand five hundred and fifty-five years of the Egyptian monarchy prior to the last Persian conquest of Egypt in the reign of Ochus ! It reminds me of the mystic wonder performed by a celebrated ventriloquist, who, stopping an honest Leith fisherwoman one morning, to look at the contents of her basket, was assured by her that they were very fresh, caught that very morning ; on which one of the fish, with a strong asseveration and broad Scotch accent, asserted, on behalf of himself and his comrades, a much remoter date for that event. Indubitable evidence ! We need not, in the present case, imitate the consternation of the honest woman in hastily abandoning the basket and its contents, attributing the occurrence to a very evil power ; for we know that it is only Dr. Lepsius ; and it will be to the satisfaction of our readers that we know it thus from his own testimony. What the monuments should speak was, except individual points, settled by him before he went to Egypt. It is not necessary, therefore, for all men to go to Egypt in order to be on a par with him as to his principal key of knowledge.

Baron Bunsen has frankly avowed that any supposed dates which exist on the monuments are to be declared erroneous whenever they do not agree with the theory of the Egyptologists. "I individually," says he, "persist in believing that the Egyptian monuments contain chronological notations, but that we do not yet understand them sufficiently to build any system upon representations of so problematical a character *." This was written in May,

* "Egypt's Place in Universal History," Cottrell's Authorized Translation, vol. ii. pref. p. xii.

1854, after Lepsius's expedition and researches, and by Lepsius's intimate friend. Again, "There are," he says, quoting Lepsius, "official documents containing notations of months or days, which *cannot be correct*; and such *blunders* must be attributed to the workmen or painters employed. For instance, it is notorious that the Rosetta stone, though containing an official text engraved on granite, has a wrong date, owing to one sign being used instead of another. There are indeed official monuments of the best Pharaonic times on which these *blunders* occur." "A blunder in the notation of the month in monuments of the new empire is easily detected, and as easily corrected. It would make a difference of 120 years in the cycle." "A blunder of this kind would be caused by the simple difference of a stroke more or a stroke less. If, therefore, *by assuming it to be a blunder*, we are relieved from an impossibility, and brought within the period previously known, we may confidently adopt it." "The representations of star-risings on the ceilings are evidently of a decorative character, and they frequently contain the *grossest blunders*, whole months being left out for want of space even in the very centre of them. Some indeed of these representations of constellations bear the names of different kings, though the rising of Sirius is perfectly identical." In short the monuments must speak, like Manetho, with Dr. Lepsius's voice. When they do, they are irrefragable; when they do not, they must be corrected; a few hundred years are put right by a stroke or two. They are charged with the grossest blunders if they differ from Baron

⁷ "Egypt's Place in Universal History," vol. iii. pp. xiv, xv.

Bunsen or Dr. Lepsius; but if the Scriptures differ from these monuments, the word of God is held less trustworthy!

Manifestly the first inquiry here is as to what the chronology of Manetho really was. If an erroneous view be taken of this, the application of it to the monuments cannot bring out a true result; and the late Sir George Cornwall Lewis has very justly placed before the bar of common sense the flexible and arbitrary nature of modern hieroglyphical interpretation⁸. Sir George had under review the best achievements of the most celebrated students of hieroglyphics, including the hieroglyphical vocabulary of Bunsen in the first volume of his work on Egypt. Mr. Birch has since added, in the fifth volume, published in the present year, a more copious extension of the vocabulary; but there is not yet any reason to suppose that it would have materially affected the grounds of Sir George's judgment, and certainly not that it would have reversed it; for the former vocabulary of Bunsen, which he had before him, was also arranged by Mr. Birch, on whose erudition and assiduous labour in it Sir George passes a high encomium⁹. My friend Mr. Reginald Stewart Poole, who in this department had early in life the highest advantages from residence in Egypt, enjoying the society and instruction of men of the highest qualifications, published in 1851 the result of an investigation of the Egyptian chronology based on his own personal hieroglyphical studies on the spot¹, in which he received the distinguished approval and concurrence of Sir Gardener

⁸ "Astronomy of the Ancients," pp. 377—396, published in 1862.

⁹ *Ibid.* p. 384, *note*.

¹ "Horæ Ægyptiacæ." Murray.

Wilkinson, of whom Bunsen appropriately speaks as one of the Nestors of Egyptian research. That result was professedly in general agreement with the Septuagint chronology. But, with the transcendent light of Dr. Lepsius, it has appeared to the author of a later work already referred to, and to the whole school whom he represents and abundantly quotes, that Mr. Poole, and Sir Gardener Wilkinson with him, had egregiously erred in their interpretation of hieroglyphics, nay, in a degree "unpardonable in the existing state of Egyptian hierology." And who then is to decide? or what stronger illustration could be given to the judgment of Sir George Cornewall Lewis, of the flexible and arbitrary nature of hieroglyphical interpretation? The fluctuating uncertainty of the conclusions based on it is indeed too much akin to the contradictory evidence of scientific experts in courts of justice. But while not attempting to judge of hieroglyphics, we may set much upon the evidence of the learned Alexandrian contemporaries of Manetho, among whom it will be remembered were those who translated the Pentateuch; and somewhat also upon Moses, who was skilled in all the learning of the Egyptians.

Now the copy of the alleged Manethonian succession of dynasties on which most reliance has been placed by the Egyptologists, is acknowledged to have come to us solely on the authority of a writer who flourished in the close of the eighth and beginning of the ninth century after Christ, namely, George Syncellus, so called from having been the *Syncellus* or *Suffragan* of Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople. "Through him alone," says Dr. Lepsius, "we possess especially the most valuable

12 THE DOCUMENTS PRINCIPALLY IN QUESTION. [INTROD.

basis for our Manethonic chronology, the dynastic lists of Africanus²." And that is the evidence preferred by these profound reasoners on antiquity to the evidence of the Old Testament Scriptures, which are to be broken and reset, and the historical monuments of Egypt also arranged, and numbered, and CORRECTED (!), according to the comparatively modern arrangement and summation of these lists! The preliminary inquiry arises, Are these lists worthy of this confidence? Are they rightly understood as so many dynasties, in our sense of the word? Do they, as now usually treated, represent Manetho's system and opinions? In short, what was the early Egyptian chronology as understood by Manetho and the ancients? It is proposed to return a demonstrable answer to these questions.

The following are the genuine or fictitious fragments of Manetho's writings which are principally in question, three, or, as often erroneously reckoned, four in number:—

1. A fragment of the book of Sothis (as the first volume of his *Ægyptiaca* appears to have been called by himself or his transcribers, from the special subject of its opening), containing Manetho's dedication of his work to his patron, Ptolemy Philadelphus, and then the application of the Sothic Cycle to the arrangement of his dynasties and the measurement of their duration.

The second part of this fragmentary document has been also separated, and, in a more corrupted form, presented by Syncellus as "an old Chronography," supposed to have existed before Manetho,

² Lepsius, *Egypt, Ethiopia, and Sinai, &c.*, Engl. Transl. p. 498.

but to have formed part of the materials used by him among the authorities for his work; by others no less erroneously conceived to be a later forgery, subsequent to the time of Eusebius, but prior to that of the monks Panodorus and Anianus. Syncellus says that Manetho "evidently took it as his starting-point;" and he is right in this; but the mistake that it existed in any thing like its present form *before* Manetho, was fallen into by him in consequence of his being unable to reconcile it with other documents which he took to be Manetho's; and from his having copies of it in a more corrupted form, in which the general statement of the Sothic scheme of Manetho had been adulterated and obscured by the interpolation of certain details, perhaps from Manetho's first book, but inserted out of place by some one who did not understand the general scheme; whence Syncellus failed to recover its original construction. In Scaliger's collection and restoration of the Greek remains of the *Chronica* of Eusebius, it is given at page 6 of his *Thesaurus Temporum*, following Manetho's dedication, and under this title:—

Θέων βασιλεία κατὰ τὸ παλαιὸν χρονικὸν, ἐκ τῶν Μανεθῶ,
THE KINGDOM OF THE GODS ACCORDING TO THE OLD RECKON-
ING OF TIME, FROM THE WRITINGS OF MANETHO.

The same title, with the omission of the words *ἐκ τῶν Μανεθῶ*, is given by Syncellus over what he in the same passage speaks of, by a mistake of his own, as *παλαιὸν τι χρονογραφεῖον*, an old chronography. If the above was the title placed over it in the work of Eusebius, and perhaps of Africanus, to whom Eusebius was largely indebted, it affords no ground, or shadow of ground, for supposing that it existed in

its present form *before* Manetho; though Manetho professed, no doubt, to have drawn it up in accordance with the evidence to which he had access. Syncellus, however, changes the word, and speaks of it in his own writing as *παλαιόν τι χρονογραφεῖον*, “a certain old chronography,” an expression by no means equivalent. The word *χρονικὸν*, in the *singular*, does not express a chronicle, chronography, or writing on chronology, but only when used in the *plural*; just as *τὰ Περσικὰ, τὰ Αἰγυπτιακὰ*, are used to express the work of this or that author on Persia or Egypt; but *κατὰ τὸ Περσικὸν* could not express a reference to any work on Persia, but to Persian *custom*. Just so that clause *κατὰ τὸ παλαιὸν χρονικὸν* means “according to the ancient style or custom in the computation of time;” and certainly does *not* mean “according to the old chronography.”

We may therefore at once reject the idea of that “certain old chronography,” as simply a grammatical blunder of Syncellus, and of the learned critics who have followed him therein³. The Manethonian

³ We have in Latin the same use of the word *chronica* in the plural, not *chronicon* in the singular, in the sense of chronicle; at least not correctly so in the singular, even in the later Latin. We seem to have it perhaps in the title “*Chronicon Paschale*.” In Greek the designation of that work used by Ducange is simply *Πασχαλίον*, and it had previously passed under the name “*Fasti Siculi*” and “*Chronicon Alexandrinum*.” It may be observed, however, that the use of the word *chronicon*, even in the Latin, in that instance, conveys the force of “*a canon or measure of time*,” not of a chronography or chronicle; “the Paschal Cycle” of 532 years being treated of in the work. Now “the old *Cycle*” is a sense which would well suit the use of the word in the superscription of the extract above considered. The title of “The Paschal Cycle” (*Chronicon Paschale*) might apparently connect that continuation or interpolated edition of the *Fasti Siculi*, which is brought down to the times of the Emperor Heraclius, with the

scheme presented in the passage itself shall be fully vindicated from objections. The *title* prefixed to the extract was manifestly written, *not by Manetho*, but by the person who made the extract, whether that person was Julius Africanus in the first instance, or Eusebius; and it expressly names and quotes Manetho as the author. In the interval which had elapsed from Manetho's days, the "old style" of the Egyptian year, with its Sothic cycle, had been changed for the Julian reckoning of time. The extract given from Manetho treats of the kingdom of the gods, in a method constructed of course on the "old style" of reckoning time; namely, the Egyptian year of 365 days, the Egyptian lunar cycle of twenty-five Egyptian years, equivalent to 309 lunations, and the Sothic cycle; and not according to what was in Eusebius's day the "new style," namely, the Julian year and its quadrennial intercalation, together with the lunar cycle of nineteen Julian years, and the solar cycle of twenty-eight.

chronological studies of Denys or Dionysius Exiguus (a competent Greek scholar) and of his junior contemporaries. For Dionysius was reputed the author of a Paschal Cycle. The title however of the *Chronicon Alexandrinum*, "the Alexandrian Canon or measure of time," by which it is also known, marks the peculiar Paschal Cycle on which it is based to be not that invented by Denys (which, Dupin informs us, was of 95 years, or equal to five times the lunar cycle of 19 years), but the longer one known long before, of 532 years, which was received from the Church of Alexandria, and by them from the learned Jews there, many of whom were believers; and ultimately by them traditionally from the prophet Daniel at Babylon, as I have reason to think. Du-cange, in his edition of it, observes in his preface, pp. ix, x, that the title is equivalent to *Computus Paschalis*; and that the Canon for the computation of Easter was Alexandrian in its origin. There seems no other obvious reason for calling this work Alexandrian except that it was based on that Alexandrian Cycle.

It may be worthy of remark that the question of the computation of time, and therefore, we may conclude, the comparison of the *vetus* and *novus computus* was particularly agitated in the time of Eusebius, and discussed at the Council of Nice, in connexion with the feast of Easter. And the author of the *Chronicon Paschale* informs us that the Council, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, sanctioned the introduction of the lunar cycle of nineteen years into the Church's computation of that festival. This cycle was previously well known; but their decree made it ecclesiastical⁴. It appears to me that this gives a considerable probability that the *title* of the extract was from the pen of Eusebius; and that afterwards, as the questions of the old Sothic and the new Julian reckoning of time receded further into the distance and were forgotten, the meaning of the words *κατὰ τὸ παλαιὸν χρονικὸν*,—"according to the old reckoning of time," became more liable to be misunderstood, till at last Syncellus fixed it to a totally wrong and ungrammatical sense.

2. The second document is the copy of the alleged *Dynasties* of Manetho, transmitted to us erroneously under the name of Eusebius. A copy of it is placed by Scaliger among the recovered or supposed remains of the Greek of the first book of his *Chronica*, in his *Thesaurus Temporum*.

3. The third is a copy of the same alleged succession of *Dynasties*, transmitted to us under the pretended name of Julius Africanus. And for this latter, which is the favourite with the Egyptologists, it is admitted that we are solely indebted to Syncellus, in the eighth and beginning of the ninth century after Christ.

⁴ *Chron. Pasch.*, *præf.*, *ed. Ducange*, pp. 9, 10, &c.

These two copies of the alleged Dynasties, which are both furnished by Syncellus, do not agree with one another; but they agree (though not exactly even here) in presenting professedly thirty or thirty-one *human* dynasties, instead of only sixteen. That in their present form and arrangement they are falsely attributed to Eusebius and Julius Africanus, appears first from the fact that Eusebius in his own work cites no human dynasty earlier than the sixteenth, and is utterly ignorant certainly of the first fourteen. Secondly, that the author of the Barbarous Latin Extracts from the chronological works of Eusebius, Africanus, and others, is also utterly ignorant of the existence of the first fourteen of those dynasties, and therefore they were not, at least in their present form, in the works of Eusebius or of Africanus, at the time of his reading them. That time was apparently in the reign of the Emperor Theodosius the Great, and not earlier than the birth of the Emperor Honorius, which is the last event he chronicles. Now Theodosius the Great died in A.D. 395, at which time Honorius was ten years old. But Eusebius died about the year A.D. 340. His labours were therefore closed, his works complete, and he had been nearly half a century in his grave, at the time when this writer perused his works and made his extracts; yet demonstrably if these dynasties, which are falsely transmitted under Eusebius's name, had been contained in his works, at least in the form of a succession of dynasties, the writer in question could not have made the statements which he does. Much more does this apply to the works of Julius Africanus, who is believed to have died about A.D. 232, a century and half before the birth of Honorius. The dynasties indeed are

quoted from Africanus, not according to the original edition of his works, but avowedly *κατὰ τὴν δευτέραν ἔκδοσιν*, which may be interpreted, “according to the re-written and falsified edition of his works in a later age.” We shall afterwards refer to this. Meanwhile, be it observed, that his works had been long before the world; and that if they had then contained the list of dynasties attributed to them by Syncellus, it is impossible that Eusebius could have been ignorant of it, or that this barbarous Latin writer, using those works, could have represented the dynasties of Manetho as he has done. It may be further noticed in passing that the pseudo-Africanian arrangement and mode of dividing the Manethonian dynasties were unknown to Timæus the Scholiast on Plato; a writer certainly later than Proclus, whom he frequently and copiously quotes, and who may probably have been one among the last heathen Platonists, before the Edict of Justinian had imposed silence on the schools of Athens, in other words, between A.D. 485 and 529⁵. For this Scholiast citing Manetho calls that Shepherd dynasty the *seventeenth*, which in the list falsely ascribed to Africanus is the *fifteenth*. He makes no mention there of Africanus or Eusebius, either in connexion with Manetho or otherwise⁶.

Yet, overlooking these facts, it has pleased the critics to decide against the genuine, and *for* the fabricated, and to make the ground of distinction between them their own preference for the superbly

⁵ Gibbon, ch. xl. vol. vii. p. 1.

⁶ Platonis Opp. Valpy's edit. vol. ix. Scholia, p. 90, Σαΐτικδ] ἐκ τῶν Μανεθῶ Αἰγυπτιακῶν ἐπτακαιδεκάτη δυναστεία ποιμένες ἡσαν ἀδελφοὶ Φοίνικες, ξένοι βασιλεῖς, οἱ καὶ Μεμφὶν εἶλον, ὃν πρῶτος Σαΐτης, &c.

elongated chronology produced by numbering thirty human dynasties, instead of only sixteen. We shall prove that that magnificent figment of the vast and anti-scriptural duration of the Egyptian monarchy is not more contrary to Scripture than to Manetho and all genuine antiquity: but, meanwhile, let it be noted that this is one principal point on which their critical decision turns; and that they have rejected the genuine fragments, and chosen the fabricated, *because they choose to have thirty human dynasties, and not only sixteen*?

But there is pretended to be found in the Armenian translation of Eusebius, an authentic copy of these dynasties justifying their being attributed to that author. The fact as to the Barbarous Latin Extracts, which has been referred to, dispels that delusion. The editor of the Armenian translation, vast and unwarranted as are his assumptions, does not

¹ To show this we may be permitted to take the following critical passage, which may also be of service as containing virtually the confession that the *vetus chronicon*, or old chronography (erroneously so called), and the extract from the book of Sothis, are substantially the same thing. “Syncellus de vetere hoc chronicō verba faciens dicit, φέρεται παρ’ Αἰγυπτίοις παλαιόν τι χρονογραφεῖον, &c., et paulo post ὁ γὰρ παρ’ Αἰγυπτιακοῦς [l. Αἰγυπτίοις] ἐπισημότατος Μανέθω, περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν λ’ δυναστειῶν γράφας, ἐκ τούτων δηλαδὴ λαβὼν τὰς ἀφορμὰς, κατὰ πολὺ διαφωνεῖ περὶ τοὺς χρόνους πρὸς ταῦτα: Facilis conjectura est, referenda hæc esse ad Pseudo-Manethonem, τῆς Σώθεως βίβλου auctorem. *Idque vel eo confirmatur, quod Pseudo-Manetho eodem modo quo vetus chronicon, triginta dynastiis et mortalium et immortalium regna comprehendisse dicitur, dum veri Manethonis triginta dynastiæ nonnisi ad mortales pertinent.*” *Mulleri Fragm. Hist. Gr.*, vol. ii. p. 513.

The distinction of the true and false Manetho should here be simply reversed, as will conclusively appear in the course of the present work, when the other points relating to it and depending on it have been examined.

even pretend a greater antiquity for it than the fifth century; and the fact alluded to goes to show that in the half-century between the death of Eusebius and the close of the fourth century his works did not contain that succession of dynasties. The same, as we have remarked, is the conclusion to be drawn from the internal evidence of the works themselves.

It is proper to add that the reasoning by which the extravagant claims put forth on behalf of the Armenian translation of the Chronica of Eusebius⁸ are professed to be supported, is as weak in substance, as it is arrogant in tone. The proud pretension of the editor of the work is that it is to be received as Eusebius's genuine and standard text, and all others approved or condemned according to their agreement or disagreement with it. In support of this stupendous assumption the editor does not profess to think any evidence at all necessary, if it were not (as he expresses it) for the "*malignant suspicions*" of some, who while they like to be sure that they are not deceived, only deceive others and themselves by an excess of subtlety⁹. We set out

⁸ "EUSEBII PAMPHILI CÆSARIENSIS EPISCOPI CHRONICON BIPARTITUM, nunc primum ex Armeniaco textu in Latinum conversum, adnotationibus auctum, Græcis Fragmentis exornatum, operâ P. JO. BAPTISTÆ AUCHER, Ancyranî, Monachi Armeni et Doctoris Mechitarista, 4to Venetiis, 1818.

⁹ "Sed ipsius operis *avθεντία* adversus malignas nonnullorum suspiciones asserenda est, qui dum se malis artibus decipi posse reformidant, alios atque adeo semetipsos nimis acuta subtilitate decipiunt, liceat nobis nonnulla *præfari*," &c. *Præf.* pp. vii, viii. It will be observed that this is on the first publication of the work. No evidence is proposed at all, except on account of "the malignant;" and to them therefore the rest of mankind are indebted for *any*, however small, amount of evidence which is given.

then under rebuke, and must be content to be classed as malignants, since we think some evidence very desirable before submitting to the arrogancy of this claim. Those small crumbs of evidence which the editor has condescended to impart we accept with much thankfulness, but not without a considerable remaining appetite, and far from reaching the comfortable state of satisfaction promised, “ut omni scrupulo atque dubitatione sublatâ ipsissimum Eusebii opus, jamdiu eruditorum votis expertum, tenere se certo sciat litteraria respubica, versionemque Haicanam, quam modo exhibemus, Eusebiani Archetypi loco habendam esse”!

But what are the proofs? Nobody, he says, can possibly doubt it who considers the constant tradition of the Armenians—“quorum plurimi linguæ Græcæ prorsus ignari”—the greater part of whose writers, as he tells us in the next page, did not understand a word of Greek; and who, therefore, we are left to infer, must have been the best judges whether it was the very text of Eusebius. He quotes and misapplies a passage from St. Augustine to show that there *could* be no better proof of its perfect authenticity than this! The works of Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Varro, and others, are received as theirs on no better evidence, in the learned editor’s opinion! Then, as if recollecting that all these bold statements are applied to a mere translation, the editor bethinks himself how the translation should be proved faithful. The most natural way (he remarks) would be to compare it with the original, but that had suffered “miserable shipwreck;” so that this test could not be applied; but it could be compared with Jerome’s Latin translation, and with the Greek fragments; and with these it was found to

agree; and so, he argues, it is certain that this Armenian work exhibits the entire and uncorrupted text of Eusebius! But what then? while the proof of this depends on its correspondence with the Latin of Jerome, and with the Greek fragments, it is straightway to be allowed to turn the tables upon these, and to be made the only standard by which *they* are to be tried! The writer has not enough of logic to know that he is reasoning in a circle. The argument flows on so convincingly to him,—“ut si quæras quod ex ipso addiderit, si auctorum loca nonnulla expendere volueris, ubi Eusebianum aliquid latere viri docti suspicantur, quod posteriores scriptores in aliam significationem distraxerint, si denique quid Syncellus aliique ex Eusebio κατὰ λέξιν, quid ad sensum citaverint, ea omnia ad hoc quod edimus opus tuto exigere possis, ac de iisdem certissime judicare. Quid ni? Cum nemo de alieno opere tam prudenter decernere possit, quam auctor de suo”!

Having settled the matter so decisively, one is almost surprised to find him beginning again in another section, “De Armeniacæ Eusebiani Chronicæ versionis Antiquitate et Auctoritate,”—“respecting the antiquity and authority of the Armenian version.” Who the author of the translation was the editor ingenuously confesses he has not the remotest idea. Nobody heard of its existence till within little more than the last half-century, when it came out with a sudden blaze of light upon Eusebius, from a quarter whence nobody expected it—“unde nemo profecto orituram suspicabatur,” as he had expressed it a little before. In the last century one Dr. James Redstone¹, Vicar of the Jerusalem Patriarch of the

¹ “Jacobus quidam Rhedestonius Doctor.” One of the learned

Armenians, when he was in the Holy City, found a manuscript of venerable antiquity, containing this Armenian version of the Chronicle of Eusebius, and, having taken it some time after to Constantinople, placed it in the library of the Patriarch's seminary of the Armenians, in that royal city. The editor heard of it, obtained liberty to examine and copy it, and immediately thought of translating it into Latin, and publishing it. But though nobody knew any thing of its existence till then, there now comes out a claim, grounded on the fact that all the Armenian world knew it, and that there was a continuous chain of tradition and testimony in its favour, which had existed, as alleged, from the fifth century! There cannot (he tells us) be a doubt that it is of that antiquity. Behold the proof with which he gratifies us, to the following effect:—

“Till the year of Christ 406 the Armenians had not even an alphabet. But when, by the singular

writers of the “Essays and Reviews,” Dr. Williams (p. 54 note), says it was Cardinal Mai who discovered it. I give the statement of the work itself. There was a rival and contemporaneous publication of a Latin version of the same Armenian translation, but without the Armenian text, in the same year, at Milan, and dedicated to Charles Albert, under the title, *Eusebii Pamphili Chronicorum Canonum libri duo, Opus ex Haicano codice a doctore Joanne Zohrabo Collegii Armeniaci Venetiarum alumno diligenter expressum et castigatum. Angelus Maius et Johannes Zohrabus nunc primum conjunctis curis Latinitate donatum notisque illustratum, additis Græcis reliquiis, ediderunt. 4to Mediolani, 1818.* The edition which I have principally used is that of Aucher; but I have also consulted that now referred to, and from what is afterwards to be mentioned it will be seen that if Cardinal Mai discovered any thing, it was not the manuscript, but the *non-existence of the pretended ancient manuscript at Constantinople!* But that will scarcely add to the weight of the authority which Dr. Williams cites and supinely relies on in his partial ignorance.

blessing of God, Mastosius, or Mesropes, found in that year the elements of the Armenian alphabet, within the next forty-four years more than six hundred volumes had been translated into that language. Moses of Choren, the father of their poets and historians, who lived the whole century and twenty years more, had a hand in these translations, and mentions some of his scholars and associates who laboured in the work. Whatever has been translated from the Greek fathers into Armenian is ascribed, it seems, to that century. Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History* was translated then, and why not also his *Chronica*? Nay, was it possible (!) that it should not have been translated then, considering what an important work it was? Some Armenian writers have mentioned or quoted from Eusebius's *Chronica*; and how could they have done that if it had not been translated, when most of them understood not a word of Greek?" The reader may judge for himself whether there be a grain of proof in all this. The editor then names one Armenian writer in the twelfth century (Samuel, a presbyter of Ania²), one

² *Armeniae Urbs ad flumen Achurium sita.* The *Summarium Temporum* of this Samuel Aniensis translated into Latin, is printed in the Appendix to the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, in the first volume of Migne's edition of that father, in the *Patrologiæ cursus Completus*; *Series Græca*; and is thus described: *Opus ex Haicanis quinque codicibus ab Joanne Zohrab Doctore Armeniaco diligenter exscriptum atque emendatum, Joannes Zohrabus et Angelus Maius primum conjunctis curis Latinitate donatum, notisque illustratum ediderunt.* His work is assigned by the editors to the period of the Patriarch Gregory the younger, who succeeded to the office, A.D. 1176. As might be expected from a writer of that late date it contains the list of the dynasties of Manetho, thirty-one in number.

It may be observed that this city, Ania, seems to have two adjectives formed from it, *Anianus* and *Aniensis*, both belonging

in the eleventh, one in the tenth (Stephanus Vartabied, also called Asolicus), one in the close of the ninth (Thomas Arzerumius); and after cursorily alluding to two more in the middle of that century, he skips over the rest to the fifth century, in which he names Lazarus Pharpensis and Moses Chorenensis, who notice or quote Eusebius's *Chronica*; all of whom, except the last, to make their evidence of any value to the point of an *Armenian translation* having then existed, must be supposed ignorant of both Greek and Latin, so that they might not have it in their power to quote from the original or from Jerome, for that would spoil the argument that they must necessarily have been using this translation. This ignorance of theirs, therefore, requires to be proved, being an essential point in the argument. He remarks that their words are, in some instances, the same with those of this translation; but it is quite possible that the translator might avail himself of the rendering of certain passages given by those well-known authors in their own country and language, and that the identity of the words in some cases might thus tell in quite the opposite direction, indicating the translator to be later than the authors from whom he adopted the rendering of certain passages. There is much, therefore, to be desiderated in the way of proof. And when at last he comes to Moses of Choren, in the fifth century, or beginning of the sixth, who is *not* supposed ignorant of Greek, and whose quotation of Eusebius might therefore plainly be from the original, he argues that one might even suspect this Moses to have been the author of the to persons who may be, or have been, suspected as corruptors of Eusebius.

translation, for no one of the others was so familiar with Eusebius³.

Admirable evidence, certainly, to support such confident assertions! wonderfully consistent with itself! After which, it may be best to come back to the former statement of the editor:—“*Ad ejus auctorem quod attinet, quisnam ille demum fuerit, haud potuisse nos, ne conjiciendo quidem, divinare, ingenue fatemur.*” It is scarcely necessary to suggest that the fewer there were who understood Greek, the slower the process of translating the Greek fathers must have been in a nation which had just got its alphabet, and the later, therefore, this translation. They who choose to accept and build upon the foundation of this literary oracle are very welcome to do so. But it was surely unfortunate that the editor, writing in an age when the manufacture of antiquities in paintings, bronzes, and other works has become a trade, should have thought it proper to suggest that he felt the work at all open to the “malignant suspicion” of having been produced “*malis artibus;*” nay, should even confess that *his own* suspicions (alas, how malignant!) were very much awakened by the first copy he received of it, which contained too much of Scaliger’s, and which actually proved to have been very much interpolated, and was returned with remarks to that effect to the transcribers⁴! What

³ Compare this with what is said by Mai in the preface of his edition from the Armenian, p. xi, “*Neque illud tamen reticendum est, a Mose [sc. Chorenense] Chronicon Africani semel appellari, Eusebii simile opus non item.*” “The Chronicon of Africanus is *once* quoted by name by Moses Chorenensis, the similar work of Eusebius *is not.*”

⁴ “*Quod cum acceperissem, et cum Eusebiano Chronico ab Scaligero edito contulisset, statim mihi suspicio quadam oborta est,*

the reason of his correspondent had been for so interpolating the copy sent, or what he had aimed at concocting by it, is not explained; but it is assumed that the new and fair transcript which was then made from it, and which appeared purged of all the suspected interpolations, represents a document of unquestionable antiquity! The reader may put these facts together, with an instructive piece of information which is furnished by the learned Angelo Mai, afterwards Cardinal, in the Preface of his Latin translation from the same Armenian or Haican Codex, published at Milan, without the Armenian text, in the very same year (1818), who tells us that the ancient manuscript, alleged to have been found, had already strangely vanished, and when sought again was not to be found at all at Constantinople⁵! What the real worth of it may be, will,

exemplum nobis transmissum haud omnino antiquo illi codici respondere, licet enim in multis a Scaligeri lectione discederet, consentiebat tamen in nonnullis; *quæ quoniam ab Eusebio ipso profecta esse non poterant, haud exiguam mihi interpellationis suspicionem injiciebant*,” &c. *Præf.* p. xxii.

“ Tres igitur Canonum Eusebianorum manuscripti codices esse cœperunt; primus *Byzantinus* membraneus, sæculo undecimo duodecimove conscriptus. . . . Princeps autem hic codex videtur ex hominum conspectu abiisse; rursus enim quæsitus in regia Turcarum urbe nequicquam est. Secundus Codex Constantinopoli confectus, sed Venetiis postea collocatus, *Venetus* a nobis appellatur. Tertius denique Venetiis a Zohrabo manu propria elaboratus, tum Mediolanum ab eodem translatus, dicatur *Mediolanensis*.” The second of these was a *copy of the first*, made for Zohrabus at his earnest request by one George Johnson,—“ qui gente Armenius, patriâ *Copolitanus* ” [which may be intended for Constantinopolitanus, or shall we say *rather Cosmopolitanus*, a countryman of Dr. Redstone?]. *Præf.* p. xiii.

After this frank acknowledgment that the Milan edition of the Armenian rendered into Latin, was made from the *same* copy with the Venetian edition, only re-copied with Zohrabus’s own hand, it

no doubt, be discovered without any discourtesy to the ingenious monks and linguistic students and alumni of the Armenian Seminaries of Rome or Venice. But there need be little hesitation in saying that the worth will be found not equal to its pretensions. Clearly it is later than the date at which the names Neirus and Sôsus⁶, in the Babylonian fragment of Abydenus, became mistaken for words expressing Chaldean periods of time—a mistake which is gone into by Syncellus, and appears from him to have been first made by Anianus and Panodorus, who flourished under the patriarchate of Theophilus of Alexandria, A.D. 385—412⁷. But the ancients know nothing of these words as designating measures of time; and Hesychius, the Greek lexicographer in the beginning of the third century, while he gives the word Σάρος, ἀριθμός τις παρὰ

is amusing to find the following passage in the preface to Migne's edition of the Chronicon, purporting to be from the same Angelo Mai:—"Duae tantummodo totius operis editiones curatae sunt, Mediolanensis videlicet atque Veneta, quæ, separatis locis studiisque factæ, haud semel inter se dissident"!!! What marvel? There comes out, however, in the same edition, a virtual acknowledgment that Mai thought the ARMENIAN had been tampered with, "Etenim luce meridiana clarius est, non pauca Armenium vel amanuensem vel interpretem de genuinis Eusebii fragmentis prætermissee, quam rem Syncellus præsertim et Chronicon Paschale (cujus nobilissimus in Vaticana Bibliotheca codex est) aperte demonstrant, de quorum veluti rivulorum ab Eusebio origine nullo modo dubitari potest." p. 29.

⁶ Sôsus occurs as the name of a king in a list of Manetho's; apud Scaliger. Thesaur. Temp. (Gr.) p. 7. It may be in both cases an abbreviation of Sesoôsis, which again will be found to be an abbreviation of Sesog-Khosis, i. e. the Sheykh of Cush.

⁷ That Syncellus himself followed them in this mistake appears from the following words of his, ὁ μὲν Βύρωστος διὰ σάρων καὶ νήρων καὶ σώσσων ἀνεγράψατο. Syncel. Chronogr. ed. Dindorf. vol. i. p. 30.

Bαβυλονίοις, says nothing of them. Anianus and Panodorus are less likely to have been read by the Armenian divines than the more distinguished Syncellus of the Patriarch Tarasius, in the eighth century, through whom the names of these two Alexandrian monks have been preserved to the world. The editor has mentioned that there was an Armenian writer in the middle of the ninth century, Zecharias, Metropolitan, or Bishop General⁸ of Armenia, with whom the Patriarch Photius of Constantinople corresponded, and who mentions the Chronica of Eusebius in his Homilies; and that in the close of the ninth century there was an Armenian writer Thomas of Erzeroum, who perpetually follows the Chronica of Eusebius, and gives his words; one in the tenth, Asolicus, who gives an abstract, and quotes whole pages of the author; one in the eleventh, and one in the twelfth, who had some acquaintance with this work of Eusebius. We are at liberty to assume, therefore, that this Armenian translation might be compiled in the close of the ninth century; or, indeed, with all these helps, as late, or later, than the last of these writers, supposing there was then a writer who understood, and could write, pure Haican Armenian as well as later critics occupied in the revision of school exercises in that language. But that is of very little consequence; neither would it take much from its value if the learned editor's own first suspicions of the *copy* had proved well founded not only as to that transcript, but as to the book itself, that it had been concocted later than Scaliger's great work. For to us it comes only with the critical evidence of the

⁸ Catholicus.

first quarter of the present century, and of an editor who, to judge from his introduction, seems to have been not very capable of reasoning or accurately estimating evidence, though very largely endowed with assurance. Moreover, the alleged ancient manuscript of the eleventh or twelfth century had a doubtful history, and a mysterious disappearance. Scaliger's marvellous work of the restoration of the first book of Eusebius's Chronica from the collection of Greek fragments is not the less, but the more valuable, because we know the avowed nature of it, and manner of its execution, that it is not to be used with absolute reliance, but with *cautioⁿ* and discrimination⁹. No doubt it contains some things which belong to Syncellus or others, and not to Eusebius. If it had come to us with the claim of an assumed ancient manuscript, its value would have been incalculably diminished. And, in like

⁹ The sources from which Scaliger collected the remains of the first book of Eusebius's Chronica are thus mentioned by him :—
 “*Græca autem quæcumque nancisci potuimus, majori ex parte a Georgio Tarasii Patriarchæ Syncello habemus; quædam etiam a Chronologo innominato beneficio viri nunquam satis laudati Isaaci Casauboni, quos Fastos Siculos vocant; neque pauca a Georgio Cedreno, qui multa Eusebiana in suum centonem inculcavit, non quidem ab Eusebio petita sed a Georgio Syncello. Accessit his cumulus comitate ejusdem quem modo nominavi præstantissimi viri σταδιονίκαι et alia immortalia monumenta quæ in calcem Græcorum Eusebianorum conjecimus quod ea sero accepissemus.*”
Scalig. Thesaur. Temp. Prolegom. p. xxiv. He has not, however, specially given his authority for each of the fragments separately; and in not a few instances he seems to have had access to some superior copies of them to those which are now generally known in the sources above specified. Scaliger's restoration of the first book of the Chronica, has been too implicitly relied on by some; it has been impugned by others, but is undoubtedly a work of inestimable value towards the recovery of the truth.

manner, when a translation of doubtful origin, unknown date and author, professing to represent a lost work, and that through the medium of a language little understood or cultivated,—a translation presented in a manuscript which is mysterious in the account of its transcription, confessed interpolation, subsequent correction, and concoction to the proper state of genuineness, and again still more mysterious in its immediate disappearance and certified non-existence at the place where it was represented to be deposited,—is put forth with the arrogant claim to be received in all respects instead of the original, and with all the weight and confidence due to the original, it is invested sufficiently, even by the effrontery of that pretension, with the character of an imposture. Whatever value it possesses is simply in its modern notes, or in the way of critical suggestion, not of evidence or authority¹.

Besides the information deducible from the careful scrutiny of the genuine or alleged Manethonian fragments, and the use made of them by Africanus and Eusebius, there is much to be learned by a comparison of the statements contained in the history of Diodorus, which, in part, are probably derived from Manetho, and admit of being reduced to parallelism, in part are divergent, and manifestly theoretical results of an alteration in the cyclical computation of time. Dicæarchus, and many other ancient writers who need not here be enumerated, have left important statements, which admit, as shall be proved,

¹ I may cite here the judicious but perhaps too mildly expressed caution of Clinton:—"We must not estimate this work [the Armenian translation] beyond its real value." *Fasti Hellen.*, vol. iii. p. 202. *Verbum sapientibus!* But this word of warning has proved insufficient for many subsequent writers.

of being reconciled with Manetho and with one another to a degree not hitherto supposed possible, and bring out a consistent testimony. These will be noticed in the order in which they most conveniently present themselves. It will also be found that there is demonstrable scientific evidence depending on the ancient Egyptian cyclical computation of time. With these it will be shown that there is direct and conclusive agreement in Holy Scripture.

It may be mentioned for the convenience of the reader, that in the present work I have used, for the basis of inquiry as regards Eusebius and Africanus, with the alleged Manethonian Dynasties, the text given in Scaliger's "Thesaurus Temporum," published in folio at Cologne in 1629, and at Amsterdam in 1658; that great work, which itself constituted an epoch in the study, furnishing obviously the most important point of departure for all subsequent investigation. But I have not neglected later criticism, particularly that of Bunsen and of Mueller. Of Syncellus I have used the edition of Goarus, and also that of Dindorff. In Scaliger's day the Chronography of Syncellus had not been edited, and he used manuscripts furnished by the learned Isaac Cassaubon, which are thought by some critics not to have been sufficiently doctored, "apographis *parum emendatis usus est*?" I suspect that

* "Sed non modo Syncelli et Chronici Alexandrini, tum temporis nondum editorum, apographis *parum emendatis usus est*," &c. *Euseb. Chron.* ed. Migne. The principle on which Scaliger went, as stated by himself in a particular instance, is worthy of consideration. "Siquid in annis regum immutatum occurret, quod ab Eusebianis rationibus discrepet; sciat candidus lector maluisse nos ea ita relinquere, quam ad rationes Eusebii castigare.

some of the manuscripts which Scaliger used were in some respects superior to those from which the editions have been printed, which have probably been mended too much. Not to mention here the many other authors abundantly referred to, the reader will find that I have made it my practice to go to the original sources, and not to take statements at second hand. The condensed results of most of the later criticism, including Boeckh's Manethonian Canon, and the critical suggestions of Lepsius, Bunsen, and others, may be found in Mueller's "Fragmenta Historicorum Græcorum." And in Bunsen's work, "Egypt's Place in Universal History," the reader will find a useful Appendix of authorities at the close of the first volume. No means of accurate information within my power has been neglected, as will sufficiently appear, it is hoped, in the following pages.

Multa enim sunt, quæ sine eorum detimento curari non possunt. Itaque ea ita, sicut a Georgio accepimus, relinquere maluimus, quam κακῷ κακὸν λάσασθαι." *Scalig. Notæ in Græca Eusebii*, p. 412.

CHAPTER I.

A CHRONOLOGICAL STATEMENT OF DICÆARCHUS CONSIDERED.

PROBABLY no more advantageous order can be adopted for the opening of a subject involving the necessity of much detailed investigation and proof than that in which the gradual progress of discovery has been developed to my own mind, and I shall therefore seek no other reason for the position here assigned to the statement which I bring first before my reader's notice.

In a valuable Greek collection of ancient historical passages, published in Scaliger's "Thesaurus Temporum," entitled "*Ιστοριῶν συναγωγὴ Collectanea Historiarum partim ex iis scriptoribus qui nondum editi sunt, partim ex iis qui editi. Penus antiquæ memoriae locupletissimum, totum fere Eusebium illustrans*"¹, there is a passage given from Dicæarchus

¹ This collection was received by Scaliger from the celebrated Isaac Casaubon, and is thus alluded to in Scaliger's Prolegomena, p. 22, after mention of his other materials, "Accessit his cumulus comitate ejusdem, quem modo nominavi, præstantissimi viri, σταδιονῖκαι, et alia immortalia monumenta, quæ in calcem Græcorum Eusebianorum conjecimus, quod ea sero accepissemus." There is the following note prefixed to the *Ιστοριῶν συναγωγὴ*, in the edition of 1658, published by Alex. More and J. Jahnsson, p. 313. (The former edition was published by Scaliger in 1606.) "NOTA. Quæ in his collectaneis historiarum, proximis aliquot paginis, alio charactere aut Notis expressa sunt, ea in exemplari

the Messenian, a philosopher and historical writer, who was a disciple of Aristotle, and who flourished, as Clinton² shows, for about forty years, from B.C. 326 to B.C. 287, being thus in the beginning of his career contemporary with Alexander the Great, and in the latter part of it with Manetho. Dicæarchus, as here represented, says, in his first book, that “after ORUS, the son of Isis and Osiris, SESONKHÔSIS became king; and so from the reign of SESONKHÔSIS to the Olympiad were two thousand five hundred years; and from the reign of NILUS [read ALEXANDER] back to the first Olympiad were four hundred and forty-six years; so that, altogether, there were two thousand nine hundred and thirty-six years.” The words are as follow:—*Δικαίαρχος ἐν πρώτῳ. Μετὰ τὸν Ἰσιδός καὶ Ὀσύριδός ὄρον, βασιλεὺς γέγονε Σεσόγχωσις. ὥστε γίνεσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς Σεσογχώσιδος βασιλείας, μέχρι τῆς Ὀλυμπιάδος, ἔτη δισκίλια φ', ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς Νείλου βασιλείας μέχρι τῆς πρώτης Ὀλυμπιάδος ἔτη υμείς³. ὡς εἶναι τὰ πάντα ὅμοιον ἔτη δισκίλια ἐννακόσια λείπειν⁴.* It is clearly

adjecta erant manu Scaligeri. Quædam præterea ab eodem leviter interpolata, et quædam penitus sublata memineris. Quæ illa, diligens ac studiosus lector, factâ collatione novæ hujus editionis cum priore, facile deprehendet.” I have compared the two editions. *The passage is the same in both*, and is therefore such as Scaliger received it from Casaubon.

² “*Fasti Hellen.*” vol. iii. p. 474.

³ The editions of Apollonius have *υλείς*’.

⁴ Scaliger, *Thesaur. Temp., Amstelodami*, 1651, Gr. p. 355. The word *Νείλου* in this passage is miswritten for *Ἀλού*, contracted for *Ἀλεξάνδρου*. The old Ionic letters resembled the Phœnician (Herod. v. 58, 59); and there was a Phœnician form of A, **N** exactly like NI, having probably a relation to the Hebrew form of Aleph **aleph**, (vid. Scalig. “*Animadv.*” p. 110, *Digressio de literar. Ionic. origine*). The knee of the letter may be observed

necessary to introduce a numerical correction in the passage, *either* in the way of increasing the sum total to 2946 (for which there is no authority), or else reducing the interval from Alexander back to

to be retained in a common form of it at the time of Alexander the Great, **Α**. Lepsius also, in his "Tabulæ of Umbrian and Oscan Inscriptions" (fol. Lips. 1841, Tab. xxxi.), gives us the Oscan or ancient Capuan form of **A**, **Ν**, easily mistaken for the *literæ ligatae* NI; whence, rounding the top, **Ν**, **Α**, **Α**.

The same passage of Dicæarchus is quoted by the Scholiast on Apollonius of Rhodes, in commenting on the fourth book of his Argonautica. But in all the editions of that author, simply following in the wake of the beautiful edition of Florence, 1496, the first printed, the text of which is in uncial characters, the Scholia in cursive without capitals, there is the corruption of reading, ἀστε γύρνεσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς σεσογχώσιδος βασιλείας μέχρι τῆς νείλου, for τῆς ὀλυμ., an abbreviation of ὀλυμπιάδος, which, written in a careless hand, or read from a slightly blotted or obliterated copy, might be mistaken. It is manifest that in the passage itself the king meant is not Nilus but Alexander, and that the reading in the following clause must have been ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς Ἀλον βασιλείας μέχρι τῆς πρώτης Ὀλυμπιάδος ἐτη υμείς (or υλεῖς'). There was also a sufficient reason why Dicæarchus should take his reckoning from the date of Alexander, but none in the world why he should concern himself about Nilus; and as the one stretch of years comes up to the Olympiad, and the other is added to it, the measure itself fixes the true person to be Alexander.

I have compared the editions of Apollonius, of *Flor.* 1496, *Francofurti* 1546, p. 227(2), *Aldus*, *Ven.* 1521, the *Elzevir* 1641, *H. Stephanus*, *Par.* 1574, and *Lipsiae* 1813. The passage in all follows the corruption in the first; and it is given in agreement with these in Mulleri "Fragm. Hist. Gr." vol. ii. p. 236, with the addition of a still more corrupted copy of it from a Paris manuscript, in which the name Σεσογχώσιδος had been altered into Σεσώστριδος; as Buttmann again has altered the name to *Sesortōsis* (*Bunsen, Egypt*, vol. i. p. 682). That the *Scholiast* understood the Sesonkhosis mentioned to be Sesotris may be admitted; but it was another thing to alter the *word*, and that is due to the transcriber of the Paris manuscript, a fit precedent for the further change of Buttmann.

the first Olympiad, from 446 to 436 years; and for this change of reading there *is* authority. Either of these two numbers would be sufficiently in agreement with historical fact, according as you date forward from the *beginning* of the first Olympiad, b.c. 776, to the termination of the Persian Empire by the death of Darius, b.c. 330, which gives the interval 446 years; or, as you date back from the death of Philip of Macedon, and accession of Alexander in Macedonia, b.c. 336, to the *end* of the first Olympiad, b.c. 772, which gives the interval 436 years. The effect of this latter reckoning would be to include the first Olympiad in the span of 2500 years from SESONKHOSIS, and therefore, consistently with this, to count back from the accession of Alexander in Macedonia to the same point (namely, the *close* of the Olympiad), 436 years. Thus, the total sum of 2936 years is to be taken previous to b.c. 336, which brings us to the year b.c. 3272 as the date given by Dicæarchus for SESONKHOSIS. If, on the other hand, the numbers were modified in agreement with the reading 446 from Alexander to the Olympiad, the effect of this, counted in the manner we have indicated, would be to place the date four years earlier, b.c. 3276. Now, either of these years (b.c. 3276, or b.c. 3272), whichever may be the date given by Dicæarchus for the earliest of mortals who is recognized as having held the sovereignty of the Egyptians, is not greatly different from the Septuagint date of the flood, as it is counted by Dr. Hales⁵, after Scaliger⁶ and others, according to which Noah

⁵ Hales's "Analysis of Chronology," vol. i. p. 215. 2nd edit. Rivingtons, 1830.

⁶ The Churches of the East, as Scaliger informs us, reckon from the Septuagint 5500 years, and no more, from Adam's crea-

left the ark in the year B.C. 3246. The late Mr. Cunningham of Lainshaw, in his tables, makes the Septuagint date of it B.C. 3216, thus *reducing* the time by about thirty years; Dicæarchus *increases* it apparently by a similar number, and, as we shall find, with better reason. It will be acknowledged that it is the Greek, or Septuagint, Chronology of the Bible which we must use in comparison with the reckoning of the Greek Gentile writers.

The date thus given by Dicæarchus goes to identify the first mortal king of Egypt, whom he calls SESONKHÖSIS, with KHÔS, or CUSH, the eldest son of Ham, the son of Noah. From HAM, or KHAM, that land received its ancient name of KHEMIA'. But it is

tion to the birth of Christ. Scaliger, however, says that in order to make the reckoning square with the theory of his Julian period, and the cycles of which it is constituted, we must reckon more precisely 5508 years, so that Christ's Nativity would be placed in the currency of the year of the world 5509. (*Scalig. Can. Isagog.* lib. iii. pp. 279—281.) But this modification (in which he had been preceded by the author of the Paschal Cycle) is *theoretical*. The late Mr. Cunningham of Lainshaw, on the other hand, on very minute investigation, but also on theoretical grounds, reduced the round number 5500 to the extent of twenty-two years, placing the date of the Creation in the year B.C. 5478, just thirty years below Scaliger's estimate. The variation of the two dates of the deluge given above will be found to be explained by this circumstance. The years from the creation of Adam to the deluge, according to the most generally approved reading of the Septuagint, accepted by Scaliger, Hales, Clinton, and Cunningham, are 2262. There is not the same room for difference of opinion as to this, as in the computation of the interval onward to the Christian era. Mr. Cunningham has pointed out the curious fact that the Septuagint measure of time from the first year of Adam to the year of the Deluge (= 2261 years) is exactly seventeen sevens of the lunar cycle of nineteen years, that is, 119 cycles.

⁷ Plutarch. "De Is. et Osir." p. 362. Psal. ev. 23. Hieron. "Quæst. Hebr." in Gen. ix. 18.

from his eldest son that the Ethiopian race is designated CUSH; and, as Thebes was reckoned Ethiopian, its sovereignty for that reason, and also, as we shall see, for other personal reasons, claimed to represent the patriarchate of CUSH. But since CUSH himself could not be at the head of a grown-up family, or incipient clan, before he was of the age of about fifty-five or sixty, the effect must be to place the date of Noah's leaving the ark, according to Dicæarchus, not thirty only, but about *eighty-five* years earlier than the computation at present ordinarily deduced from the Septuagint. We shall see by and by whether there be reason to think that the true and ancient chronology of the Septuagint was here in accordance; and it need only be remarked now, that if the full scriptural allowance of 400 years be made for the sojourn of Israel in Egypt, *that* would have the effect of placing the Septuagint date of the flood about eighty-five years further back, the rest being sufficiently allowed for in their having placed the exodus a century too high.

The name itself, which with strict adherence to the Greek we may spell SESOG-KHÔSIS (there being nothing to prove the letter *n*, which is only an adaptation for the sake of euphony), directs us to KHÔS or CUSH⁸, the son of Ham, and to the sovereignty in his line. It may be read שֵׁשָׁךְ קָשָׁשׁ, SHESHAKH-CUSH. The former part of this compound name or title, SHESHAKH, which is applied by Jeremiah to the king of Babylon⁹, is said by Gesenius to be of uncertain origin. I know not whether it have not some trace-

⁸ LXX, Χούς.

⁹ It is the *king* who is meant, and not a *place* (Jer. xxv. 26; li. 41); though the English Authorized Version inserts the preposition “*of*”—“King [*of*] Sheshach.”

able affinity with the Arabian word SHEYKH, which is not unlike it, dropping only the reduplication, which, on Horne Tooke's principle of the *Epeä Pteroënta*, has taken to itself wings and flown away. The resemblance of Shishakh and Sheykh appears much closer than that of the latter with the word Zaken, with which Dean Stanley represents it as nearly identical¹. The word *Sheykh* is used to signify the head of a tribe; and hence often associated with the idea of a venerable old man invested with a religious reverence as one holy. The first ideas of sovereignty sprang from this origin: and as Jeremiah might not choose offensively or with unnecessary plainness to express the prediction against the king of Babylon by name, he uses this term in its vagueness, yet in a manner sufficiently intelligible of his sacred majesty, as the principal Sheykh. Clearly no idea could with more propriety be applied to the patriarch Cush by his descendants than this of sacred tribal or patriarchal veneration, and holy authority thereon grounded. The same may be the explanation of the designation of the King of Egypt, SHISHAK, to whom Jeroboam fled from Solomon. In this case also it is a tribal title, rather than a personal name; for we do not find this name of an Egyptian king in the Gentile historians, and we find that the king of Egypt in Solomon's days was called by the name of Hophra². If then this patriarchal title had become appropriated

¹ "On the Jewish Church," Lect. vii. p. 161. Perhaps the word to which the dean refers is the same which is represented in a passage of Agathias, quoted by Scaliger, Σεγὰς Σαὰ, *Sagan Shah*, which Agathias renders as equivalent to Σεγεστανῶν βασιλεὺς. *Scalig. Canon. Isagog.* lib. iii. p. 315. But it may be that this is rather the title *Sagan*, which we meet with in the Babylonian history in Scripture.

² Euseb. ap. Scalig. "Thesaur. Temp." p. 36.

by the descendants of Cush to their tribal chief, the use of it in this case might indicate that king of Egypt to be of an Ethiopian or Theban dynasty. Accordingly the vast army of the Shishak who invaded Judæa and despoiled Jerusalem in the fifth year of Rehoboam consisted largely of Lybians, Sukkiim or Troglodites³, and *Ethiopians*⁴: and within twenty-six years afterwards, in the eleventh year of the reign of Asa⁵, the Ethiopian element in the invading host, as much as in the reigning dynasty, had become predominant; for the army, then consisting of a million, is described as Ethiopians and Lybians, and their general in chief is called “Zerah the Ethiopian⁶. ” It is observable that in the Greek rendering of “SHISHAK,” which is “*Sousakeim*,” and in the Latin “*Sesac*,” as well as in “*Sesog-Khōsis*,” the *sh* is represented by *s* without the aspirate; and the *plural* form, which that name or title has taken in the rendering of the Greek translators, might be explained if the king was regarded as the ROYAL PATRIARCHAL HEAD of a number of chiefs or SHEYKHS, each at the head of his own tribe; the prince, in short, of the Cushite clans; an honour which was no doubt, with others, at a later period transferred, by concession or by force, to the King of Babylon, as “KING OF KINGS⁷,”—as we may say, “SHEYKH OF SHEYKHS.”

³ A people who inhabited all the western coast of the Red Sea, especially that bordering on Ethiopia.

⁴ 2 Chron. xii. 2, 3.

⁵ The first ten years of Asa were years of peace, 2 Chron. xiv. 1.

⁶ 2 Chron. xiv. 9, 13; xvi. 8. An unfounded opinion has been supported by some of the learned that this army was not that of the Sovereign of Egypt, but Arabian. But the retreat of the army was towards Egypt; and what other power could combine the *Lybians* with the *Ethiopians*?

⁷ Dan. ii. 37. The same dignity was claimed by Sesoösis (an

The chronology of Dicæarchus, therefore, presents only a moderate elongation of that which is usually ascribed to the Septuagint: and we shall find by and by sufficient grounds for thinking that it is in perfect accordance with the ancient and genuine computation used by the authors of that version.

In this explanation of the passage and the chronology which it represents, we have been proceeding upon what appears, on the authority of the manuscripts used by Casaubon, and from all internal probability, to be the true reading of Dicæarchus. But it may be proper also to consider what view, or rather what confusion of the chronology, must have been held by those who first adopted that old corruption of the reading of Dicæarchus which we find in the Scholia to Apollonius's poem of the Argonauts in all the editions from 1496 downward⁸. This Apollonius, surnamed Rhodius, is said to have been the third librarian of the celebrated Alexandrian library, under Ptolemy Euergetes. It is not he, however, but his anonymous commentator or scholiast, of a later age, who has quoted Dicæarchus. The effect of the corruption in the quotation, as now read there, is to carry the sum of the time four hundred and thirty-six years further back; which would make *Noah* the Sesog-Khōsis, or head of the patriarchal staff of Cush: while on the other hand there is an evident tendency in the Scholia to confound that Sesog-Khōsis with Sesostris, who, no doubt, in a later period became the Sesog-Khōsis or Sheykh of Cush. Now we shall have occasion by

abbreviated form of the title Sesog-Khōsis), as appears from the inscription he placed on the pillars recording his victories, Τήνδε τὴν χώραν ὅπλοις κατεστρέψατο τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ βασιλεὺς βασιλέων καὶ δεσπότης δεσποτῶν Σεσώστις. Diodor. i. 56.

⁸ See above, p. 36, note.

and by to show that Noah actually *was* so confounded with Sesostris by Alexander Polyhistor. The narrative of the Noahic deluge has been mixed up by him with the story of Sisuthrus or Sesostris; and the cause of that confusion was the Cataclysm, or overwhelming in the Red Sea, of the third Sesostris and his army. There was therefore some slight ground of excuse for the mistakes of the Scholiast, or of his transcribers, whichever of them may be answerable for the corruption of Dicæarchus.

CHAPTER II.

THE EGYPTIAN MYTHICAL PERIODS OF DIODORUS; THEIR SOURCE DEMONSTRATED, WITH A VIEW TO THE DISENTANGLING OF THAT WHICH IS HISTORICAL.

IN the investigation of the long theoretical Egyptian periods of time it is necessary for the reader to have clearly in view the following definitions:—

I. A cycle is a period of time returning into itself, and reproducing its parts in the same order.

II. The Lunar Cycle of nineteen years is a period containing 235 lunations, in which the sun and moon return nearly to the same relative position towards the earth at the same time of the solar or Julian year. This cycle, however, was not in accordance with the uniform Egyptian year of 365 days; because from the omission of the intercalary days of the leap years, there was a divergence of four or five days in nineteen years. Prior therefore to the introduction of the Julian calendar they used a different Lunar Cycle of twenty-five Egyptian years, equal to 309 lunations, of which we shall afterwards have occasion to speak, and which we shall call distinctively the *Egyptian* Lunar Cycle.

III. The Solar Cycle of twenty-eight years is a multiple of the Julian intercalary period of four years

by the number of the days of the week. All the possible changes in the day of the week on which the Julian year commences occur in this time, and then return again in the same series.

IV. The Paschal Cycle is a multiple of the Solar Cycle by the Lunar (28×19), and consists therefore of 532 years; in which period all the changes in the time of the keeping of the passover in regard to the day of the week and of the month had taken place, and would according to the Julian year return again in the same order. This cycle is often, but erroneously, said to have been first introduced by Dionysius the Little in the sixth century: but it was not unknown to the calculations of the Jews from the time of the Babylonish captivity, as I have elsewhere shown ground to think.

V. The Julian Period is a multiple of the Paschal Cycle by the Roman Indiction, which was a period of fifteen years. It amounts therefore to 7980 years. In other words it is the product of the Solar Cycle multiplied into the Lunar, and that again by the Indiction ($28 \times 19 \times 15 = 7980$ years). Scaliger adjusted it so that these three cycles should begin together from the 1st of January, B.C. 4713; and it has this property that no year in the course of the whole period had the same characteristics, as regards these three cycles, with any other year of it. Though this period is modern in its present form, yet we shall prove that there was known and used by some of the philosophers at Alexandria a great Julian Cycle, from which Scaliger appears to have borrowed it; a cycle utterly different from that which we next mention.

VI. The Sothic or Canicular Cycle is the revolution of the old Egyptian or Nabonassarian year of

365 days in relation to the sidereal heavens, approximately estimated; which takes place in consequence of the Egyptian year not having a day intercalated every fourth year. This cycle therefore, if measured by comparison with the Julian year, consists of 1461 of these Egyptian years, equal to 1460 Julian years, in which space of time the omitted intercalary days amount to a whole year; and the months and days would come round again, as they estimated, to the same point in relation to the rising of the star Sothis, also called Sirius or Canis, from which the cycle takes its name.

VII. The Cycle of Eclipses, the same with the Chaldean Saros, consisted of 223 lunations, or equal to 18 Egyptian years (uniformly of 365 days each), besides 15 days, 7 hours, 43 minutes, 20 seconds; in which time the sun, moon, and nodes, after being once in a line of conjunction, return very nearly to the same position, giving rise to a recurrence of the same eclipse. The Chaldeans formed a still more accurate cycle of three saroses, amounting to 54 Egyptian years, 45 days, 23 hours, 10 minutes. And Pliny mentions an Egyptian cycle of 540 years; which may be, in round numbers, a multiple of that cycle by ten: for thirty measures of the Saros, if expressed in the *Julian* notation of time, are 540 years and a fraction, or considerably under 541 years, and form just one-half of the period which completes the whole recurring phenomena of each eclipse. Tacitus alludes to this or some similar Egyptian Cycle, stated in round numbers at 500 years, and it is known that the whole of the recurring phenomena of an eclipse are sometimes from circumstances completed in about a thousand years: but it may be doubtful whether the period so spoken

of by him bore this relation to the Saros, or was a rough, inaccurate statement of the period of 532 Julian years, the Paschal Cycle, also called the Alexandrian¹; or of a period of 532 *Egyptian* years, which seems to have been used earlier in the exact adjustment of lunar time subordinately to the cycle next mentioned.

VIII. To these we may add what may be called the Luni-canicular Cycle, which was a multiple of the Sothic or Canicular Cycle by the Egyptian Lunar Cycle of 25 Egyptian years. Of this cycle also we shall have occasion to speak more fully afterwards. Its invention is attributed by Manetho, and with general consent, to Thoth, the Egyptian Hermes; and if combined with an adjustment of lunar time amounting to one day in 532 *Egyptian* years, it would be almost absolutely correct².

Of these cycles the Canicular or Sothic and the Luni-canicular, together with the above-named subsidiary measure of 532 Egyptian years, as also the Cycle of Eclipses, belong to the ancient Egyptian mode of reckoning; and the Lunar Cycle of nineteen solar years was probably known to the Chaldeans long before the time of Meton or of Manetho. But the Solar and Paschal Cycles depend upon the Jewish division of time by Sabbaths and Passovers, and also upon the Julian year, or a year of equivalent

¹ Mr. R. S. Poole ("Horæ Ægypti," pp. 24, 50) suggests that it was the third part of a greater cycle of 1500 complete Egyptian years, which form, as he shows, a *Tropical Cycle*, so named by him. Whether he has proved that the ancient Egyptians knew and made use of that cycle, or not, Tacitus seems to speak of a *cycle*, rather than the section of one, a thousand years from its completion.

² See below, in chap. v.

measure³. There is reason to think that the Israelites in Egypt previous to the Exodus had practically lost sight of the sabbatical division of days, and we may therefore conclude that the week was not thus marked by the Egyptians⁴. The existence of the Sothic Cycle, while it proves that the Egyptians knew the measure of the year to be nearly equal to 365½ days, proves also that they did not intercalate a day in the fourth year in the manner of the Julian calendar, but allowed the odd quarters of days to accumulate. We learn historically that the golden circle in the tomb of Osymandyas divided the year into 365 days.

On these particulars we may base the following general proposition, which will be found illustrated by the results of our investigation :—

ALL THEORETICAL PERIODS OF TIME DEPENDING ON THE SOLAR AND PASCHAL CYCLES ARE TO BE HELD NOT PURELY EGYPTIAN, BUT ALEXANDRIAN, OR JUDÆO-EGYPTIAN; AND THEIR INTRODUCTION IN EGYPT AND GREECE IS OF A LATER PERIOD THAN THAT OF MANETHO, IN WHOSE TIME THE YEAR CONTINUED TO BE ADJUSTED THEORETICALLY TO THE RISING OF THE STAR SOTHIS BY THE SOTHIC CYCLE.

³ Dodwell, in his work “*De Veteribus Græcorum Romanorumque Cyclis*,” *Dissert. ix.* § 10, p. 380, admits that the same measure of the year was known to the Pythagorean philosophers, and even practically used among the Romans, before⁴ the Julian Calendar, but determined in a different manner. “*Erat quidem is idem modus anni solaris apud Romanos in antiquioribus Julio Cyclis. Et Equinoctium viii. Kal. Apriles; sed pro modo Juliano, supponebant vetustiora Julio parapegmata, ut alibi ostendimus (app. ad Præl. *Camden.*). Sed potius a Magnæ Græciæ, vel Siciliæ, Pythagoræis instituta arbitror illa parapegmata quam a Græciâ proprie ita dictâ.*”

⁴ *Exod. xvi. 22—30. Deut. v. 15.*

We proceed now to the statements as they are transmitted to us by Diodorus.

The chronology of Diodorus has been much misconstrued; and it appears likely also that he, in some respects, misapprehended the meaning of the information which he received from the priests of Egypt, and from their books. But his works afford us to a considerable extent the means of correcting the errors arising from both these sources. To illustrate the prodigious degree to which statements may be fastened upon an author for which he is not responsible, I may cite Rodoman's Latin translation of a passage in the forty-fourth chapter of the first book, to the following effect:—“There reigned in Egypt (as some of them mythically relate), at the first, gods and heroes for rather less than eighteen thousand years, and the last king was Horus, the son of Isis. *The kingdom was then governed by men for almost fifteen thousand years*, down to the hundred and eightieth Olympiad, in which I came to Egypt, when Ptolemy, called the New Dionysius⁵, was king.” “*Ab hominibus autem regnum per quindecim fere millia annorum gubernatum*,” &c. Now the Greek of which this clause professes to be a translation is ὅπ' ἀνθρώπων δὲ τὴν χώραν βεβασιλεῦσθαι φασὶν ἀπὸ μυριάδος ἔτη βραχὺ λείποντα τῶν πεντακισχιλίων. But these words palpably do not affirm that they ascribed to the rule of men a duration of fifteen thousand, but of “somewhat less than five thousand years.” There may be a difficulty about the words ἀπὸ μυριάδος; but, if that be not, as is

⁵ i. e. Ptolemy Auletes, the father of the celebrated Cleopatra. His accession as a minor was B.C. 81, his recognition by the Romans B.C. 59.

most likely, a corrupt reading, yet, even taken as it stands, it must mean “*of* or *from* a myriad,” not *in addition* to it, which would be expressed by *πρός*⁶. Wesselung mentions that some manuscripts give ἀπὸ Μούριδος or *Mύριδος*, i. e. “from Moeris”⁷; but he justly remarks, that Moeris not being the first of the human kings, the reckoning cannot be begun from him. He proposes, therefore, either the rejection of the two words, or the substitution of ἀπὸ Μηνᾶ, from Menês; but he admits the latter to be a somewhat violent change. I would suggest, on the evidence of the passage itself, as to the point from which the reckoning is taken, that the source of the mistake has been a contracted or abbreviated writing of *ΑΠΟ ΜΩΡΙΣΙΔΟΣ*, for ἀπὸ μὲν Ὁρους Ἰσιδος, “from Orus, son of Isis”—the same Orus mentioned by Dicæarchus in the last extract, who seems to be the Apollo or Exemplar of the human race, the **ADAM** of Holy Scripture, “*Son of God*,” as he is called by the Evangelist St. Luke, whose reign preceded that of all the *sons of men*; for Adam is called **Al** Orus in a Chaldean fragment, as we shall find. See also in the Appendix, Note A.

If such an enormous mistake was possible to be made of the chronological meaning of Diodorus, and that by learned men, it may reasonably be allowed that Diodorus also, in some particulars, may have misapprehended the information given to him by the

⁶ Compare the difference of the construction in a parallel case in Æschylus, “Prom. Vinct.” 772, Τρίτος γε γένναν πρὸς δέκ' ἀλλασσούς γοναῖς.

⁷ I see that this reading is adopted by Aucher in one of the notes to his edition of the *Chronica* of Eusebius from the Armenian. And it is followed by Sir G. C. Lewis, “*Hist. of Astr.*” p. 332.

priests of Egypt, or by their books. It is manifest, however, from what he says, that as to their long mythical periods they were not agreed in their statements, or in their methods of arriving at them; but they clearly followed conflicting calculations, based upon different cycles. We must gather what we can from their agreements and from their discrepancies.

A more exact statement of the longest measure which they ascribed to the duration of the human kingdom is given by Diodorus, as follows, in the sixty-ninth chapter of the same book:—“The Egyptians affirm that the invention of alphabetic writing, and the observation of the stars, originated among them; and that, besides these, the theorems of geometry, with most of the arts, had been discovered by them, and the best laws had been established. And of these facts, they say, the greatest proof is, *that kings of Egypt, for the most part natives, had reigned more than four thousand seven hundred years*, and their country had been the happiest in the whole world, which would never have been the case if the inhabitants had not possessed the best laws and customs, and the best educational institutions. Now, whatever Herodotus, and some of those who have composed histories of the Egyptians, have improvised from memory, with the inclination to relate the marvellous rather than the true, I will pass over; and, having carefully examined the exact statements written by the priests of Egypt in their books, these I will set forth.”

Thus the “little less than five thousand years” of the mythic⁸ duration of their human kingdom is

⁸ Μυθολογοῦσι δ' αὐτῶν τινὲς, &c., lib. i. c. 44.

here otherwise stated as “a little over four thousand seven hundred.” Diodorus came to Egypt about the beginning of the 180th Olympiad⁹. Counted back, then, from the 180th Olympiad, which began in the middle of B.C. 60, these years would reach to the middle of B.C. 4760; and allowing the “little over,” this would carry back into the year preceding, namely, B.C. 4761. This reckoning, we shall presently show, was really taken back to the beginning of an old theoretical measure of chronology, corresponding in its nature and use to the Julian Period; in which the Alexandrians had forestalled Scaliger, if he be not convicted of unavowed plagiarism of their idea. The commencement of the Julian Period was fixed by Scaliger to the first of January, B.C. 4713, which is forty-seven years later, or a “little more;” but that interval of years will be found exactly accounted for, resulting, as a consequence, from shifting the day of commencement from the month of September to the first of January. This theoretical period may, from the intercourse of the Egyptians with the Jews of Alexandria, have been applied to the outline of primeval history; and it appears that, on a computation somewhat differing from that of the Septuagint, they sometimes traced upward the succession of their kings beyond Cush, through the whole line of his pedigree, even to Adam, “son of God,” as he is called by the Evangelist St. Luke, to whom they thus gave the appellation of “Orus, the son of Isis or Nature,” and whose reign preceded that of all the sons of men, himself no son of man. He is called Al-Orus in the fragments of Chaldean history, as will be found below, in a table of their first kings, in the latter part of

⁹ Clinton, “*Fasti Hellen.*”

Chapter V. The Septuagint date of the Creation is b.c. 5508, according to Scaliger, following, on the whole, the computation of the Constantinopolitan, Russian, and Abyssinian Churches, but b.c. 5586 according to the computation of Abulfaragi, as Hales states it, which is here probably in closer agreement with the true ancient reckoning of the Septuagint. In the one computation, the death of Adam was b.c. 4577, according to the other b.c. 4655. It is therefore not remarkably wide of the Septuagint reckoning, that from Adam to the time of Diodorus is here stated to be a period of less than 5000 years, and over 4700. This reckoning may have first come to the Egyptians and Babylonians through Jewish channels of information; for Eusebius tells us that none of the Gentile nations had any antediluvian records; and in the preceding extract from Dicæarchus, and also, as we shall find, in the Chaldean fragments which transmit the statements of Berosus, there is no record between Adam and the period of the Deluge. It is to be observed, however, that Diodorus treats that measure of time as mythical—at least it first occurs in an account of the Egyptian chronology which he expressly affirms to be mythical,—and there may thence be some reason to think that it was modified by them to suit some theoretical period similar to the Julian.

It is true that the Julian Period was only introduced by Scaliger in the year of our Lord 1580; but the suggestion of its principle and method of application was borrowed by him from the Greeks¹, and

¹ “Hæc posterior Periodus Julianus dicitur; quoniam ad methodum anni Juliani ejusque cyclorum accommodata est ab auctore illius Scaligero, *quam a Græcis ille mutuatus est.*” Petav. “Ration. Temp.” P. II. lib. i. c. 4.

it was based by him on ancient and well-known cycles, namely, the cycle of the sun (twenty-eight years) multiplied by the cycle of the moon (nineteen years), and that by the Roman Indiction (fifteen years), giving a product of 7980 years. The last of the three cycles which enter into this product, namely, the Roman Indiction, took that name from the appointment of the tribute or taxation by Constantine at the end of every third lustrum, or period of five years. But it was not exclusively that civil and imperial application of the period which gave it importance in chronology; otherwise it had been more transitory. Petavius tells us that the learned in his day were not agreed about its origin²; and that the Greeks counted their Indiction, not as the Romans from the first of January, but beginning in September³. No doubt for the purposes of the imperial taxation it did not exist so early as the time of Diodorus; but at least as a multiple, or a part, of other known cycles, it existed. There is precisely its double, a Thirty-year Period, *τριακονταετηρίς*; of the recognized existence and use of which in the time of the Ptolemies of Egypt we have singular and decisive proof in the inscription of the Rosetta Stone⁴. Ptolemy Epiphanes is there called *κύριος*

² Petav. "Rationar. Temp." P. II. lib. i. c. 3.

³ "Indictionem Romano more a Calendis Januarii auspicamur; quam Græci ab antecedente Septembri repetere solent." Ibid. p. 745, ed. Lugd. Batav. 1710.

⁴ In the department of Egyptian Antiquities, Brit. Mus. A facsimile of the Greek portion of the inscription may be found given in Mueller's "Fragmenta Hist. Græc." at the close of the first or second volume. The Arabians, too, had a cycle of thirty years, or *triacontaëteris*, of the ingenuity of which Scaliger speaks very highly, Canon. Isagog. lib. iii. p. 247. But this was probably of a different nature.

τριακονταετηρίδων καθάπερ ὁ Ἡφαιστος ὁ μέγας, “Lord of the Thirty-year Periods, like the great Vulcan.” Now Vulcan was esteemed the oldest of the Egyptian gods, from whom the *generations* of gods and men began their course. This Thirty-year Period, multiplied by the product of the cycles of the sun and of the moon, would give precisely the double of the Julian Period; which latter would thus be comprehended in it, and might correspond with it in its beginning, and begin again at its bisection. As thirty years are the measure of a generation, we have hence the stronger probability of its being employed in their theoretical computations of the successive generations of human history. The approximate coincidence of the beginning of the Julian Period with that Egyptian mythical estimate of the past duration of their human kingdom is therefore well worthy of notice. Of course this great Period being theoretical, and grounded upon the points of coincidence of the three cycles of which it is the product, the adjustment of it to the actual chronology must depend much on the point from which you set out⁵. The Indiction, as reckoned by the Romans, began from the first of January; as reckoned by the Greeks, from the September preceding⁶. Scaliger adjusted his Julian Period so that the commencement is placed on the first of January, 4713 years before the Christian era. The Alexandrian men of science seem to have adjusted their corresponding cycles in such a manner that they took the starting-point not from January B.C. 4713, but from the September of the year B.C. 4761.

⁵ See Clinton, “Fasti Hellen.” vol. iii., Introd. p. xiv.

⁶ Petav. “Rationar. Temp.” P. II. lib. i. c. 3. See the words cited above.

The Solar Cycle of 28 years belongs distinctively to the Julian year, being the product of the Julian intercalary period of four years multiplied into the days of the week; and we know that the reform of the Calendar by the Julian year was in contemplation about the time when Diodorus went to Egypt, because it was actually carried into public effect by Julius Cæsar not more than fourteen years later, B.C. 46. Public changes of that nature are not made without long previous discussion and preparation of the mind, at least among the well-informed and influential classes. Dodwell indeed affirms, as already quoted, that the same measure of the solar year was in use among the Romans in cycles more ancient than the Julian year; and that they also fixed the vernal equinox to the 25th day of March, but instead of the Julian employed older methods. That measure of the year is supposed by him to have come to them from the Pythagorean philosophers of Sicily and *Magna Græcia*⁷. Pythagoras may have imported it from Babylon. What marvel then that we find the elements of the Julian Period, or of the greater cycle of generations which contains it, and which is precisely its double, presenting themselves at the time of Diodorus; and that we find a theoretical antiquity based on their result, not very different from that which Scaliger has actually assumed as the theoretical starting-point of his Julian Period? The difference between the commencement of the Julian Period as adjusted by Scaliger, and the date to which the computation given by Diodorus would conduct us, happens curiously to be the sum

⁷ Dodwell, "De Cyclis," Dissert. ix. § 10, p. 381; cited above, p. 48.

of the Julian *Solar* and *Lunar Cycles* ($28 + 19 = 47$ years), with the addition only of the interval from the first of January back to the September preceding. For 4700 years counted back from Diodorus's coming to Egypt at the beginning of the 180th Olympiad b.c. 60⁸, conduct us to b.c. 4760; and that is just 47 years before b.c. 4713, to which Scaliger adjusted the commencement of his Julian Period. But the additional months back to September carry us into the year b.c. 4761.

Let us see then whether that month and year would give the requisite conditions for commencing the Period from; namely, that the Solar and Lunar Cycles should begin together, and the Indiction, or the corresponding Alexandrian cycle, at the same time. As to the last, we have already referred to what Petavius says, that it began in September. As to the Solar Cycle, in the first place, the year b.c. 4761 like b.c. 4713 was a leap year. But the reform of the calendar by Julius Cæsar had not then been introduced, and the intercalation even afterwards was not made by the Alexandrian philosophers in the Roman manner by placing it after the Roman feast of the Terminalia, as a repetition of the sixth day in the reckoning of the days before the Kalends of March, *bis sextus dies ante Kalendas Martias*, from which the leap years received and still retain the appellation of *bissextile*. They simply added it to the five days called *epagomenæ* at the end of the

⁸ Clinton assigns that date to Diodorus's coming to Egypt. We shall find a little after that Diodorus gives a measure of time which implies that at the time of his *then* writing it was probably the close of that Olympiad b.c. 57, or the beginning of b.c. 56. But there is no inconsistency here. He may still have come at the earlier date, as Clinton indeed proves that he did.

year, as one day over the 365 days, making a sixth of the epagomenæ. This method became fixed for a considerable time at Alexandria, in their reckoning of the civil year from the date of the entry of Augustus into that city, August 29, B.C. 29^o. But before that date, as it existed in philosophical speculation only, the position assigned to the theoretical day of intercalation, depending on the time at which the year closed, would vary with the termination of the movable Egyptian year, from which the reckoning happened to be taken. Counting back then from Scaliger's commencement of the Julian Period, January 1, B.C. 4713, forty-seven complete Julian years, and further back to the same state of the moon in the month of September (we assume it to be new moon in both instances), the interval must be measured by complete lunations, and gives us 585 lunations, which by Mayer's tables amount to 17,275 days, 9 hours, 28 minutes, $6\frac{2}{3}$ seconds. Again, if we take 47 years at the Julian measure of $365\frac{1}{4}$ days, and add to them 109 days for the interval back from January 1 to the 14th of September, it gives us 17,275 days, 18 hours, or within six hours of 17,276 days: and if we allow twelve intercalary days to the period, it would be that complete number. Now dividing that number by seven for the weeks, it gives 2468, without remainder. We are thus conducted back to the same day of the week; and the same day of the moon also; for deducting the exact measure of the lunations above given, from the Julian measure of the time now assumed, it will be found that the lunation began on the first day of it (September 14th), the time contained in the assigned

^o See Clinton, "Fasti Hellen." vol. ii., Append. pp. 297-8; and vol. iii. p. 356.

number of lunations being just eight hours and a half short of the *exact* Julian time; or fourteen hours and a half short of it as reckoned according to the intercalated days of leap year. In short, from the 14th of September, b.c. 4761, the period would be reckoned from the same day of the week, the same day of the moon, and the same in respect of leap year, as from January 1, b.c. 4713, to which Scaliger shifted it.

Now, that the immense theoretical period which I have mentioned, extending to two full Julian periods, was really in use by the informants of Diodorus, and that it consisted of the product of the Cycle of the sun multiplied by the Cycle of the moon ($28 \times 19 = 532$), and that again multiplied by the thirty years of a generation, giving 15,960 years in the whole, appears from the following facts. Diodorus mentions in the next chapter¹, 52 native kings successors of Menes, or, including Menes himself, 53 *generations*; while here he mentions, besides, *four* of Ethiopians; then, after speaking of the Persians, who are excluded as wholly foreign to the succession, he says that *all the remaining ages were occupied by 475 native sovereigns*, of whom five were women. Now adding these together ($53 + 4 + 475$), the sum is 532 generations, which, at the recognized rate of 30 years to a generation, give 15,960 years, exactly two complete Julian Periods. In short it is what may be called their Soli-lunar Cycle of generations, consisting of the Cycle of the sun multiplied by the Cycle of the moon, and that multiplied again by the Thirty-year Period or *τριακονταετηρίς*, of the received use of which we have distinct evidence from the Rosetta Stone.

¹ Lib. i. c. 44.

There is nothing parallel to this in the history of Herodotus; and the reason is that the cycles on which it was based were of later introduction in Egypt than his day. He states indeed² that the Egyptian priests had read to him from a book the names of 330 sovereigns, among whom there were eighteen Ethiopians and one queen, namely, Nitocris. But even if these are to be considered all successive, the number here is of a different nature, bearing relation rather to the number of the days of the year. Thirty-five generations indeed would be wanting to complete the number of 365; but if the reckoning was taken only down to Nitocris, that supplement of thirty-five generations, though not specified, might be tacitly allowed for the period which had elapsed since the dynasty to which she belonged: and this is the more likely since in another chapter of the same book the reckoning is of 341 generations down to *Sethos*. Now these thirty-five generations, if taken as Thirty-year Periods, and measured back from the time of Herodotus, would carry back to about B.C. 1506³, or a year or two earlier; but measured back from the Persian conquest of Egypt they would carry back to B.C. 1575: the latter of which dates may certainly stand in connexion with the period of the Sesostrian dynasty, and indeed affords an approximation to the probable date of the death of Nitocris, which we shall find reason to place about six years earlier, and about forty years preceding the Manethonian date of the Exodus of Israel. For it will appear afterwards⁴

² Lib. ii. c. 100. Compare c. 142.

³ Herodotus read his history at the Olympic games, at the age of twenty-eight, B.C. 456. *Clinton*.

⁴ See the general observations on the catalogue of the kings in the first section of Chap. X.

that while the Chronology of Manetho agrees with the Septuagint as regards the earliest period of the Monarchy in Egypt, it brings the times of the Exodus considerably nearer to an accordance with the Hebrew. We may therefore not unreasonably conjecture that, allowing thirty-five generations for the period downwards from the Sesostrian Dynasty, to which Nitocris belonged, to the Persian conquest, the priests at the time of Herodotus theoretically assumed a GREAT YEAR OF GENERATIONS as their grand mystic and all-comprehensive measure; taking a generation corresponding to every day of the 365. The interval back to Sethos and Sennacherib counted on the same principle is further from the truth⁵. But there is nothing here to indicate any different year from the Egyptian; nothing corresponding to the cycles based upon the Julian Calendar, as they are indicated in the mythic periods mentioned by Diodorus. The Egyptian priests in their conversation with Herodotus evidently proceeded on the Canicular Cycle, and have in one part of their statement furnished thence an antidote to their own exaggeration. For they told him that in the interval which had elapsed since Menes, the sun had four times departed from his then wonted

⁵ The excessive interval of twenty-four generations which is allowed in this case (which, measured from the same point, would carry back to B.C. 1176 or B.C. 1235) may be owing to their having confounded the Ethiopian king Sabacus, who shortly preceded Sethos, with an earlier Ethiopian king, in some part of the unsettled times after the overthrow of Pharaoh in the Red Sea; a mistake which might readily happen, since that king also would bear the common title of the *Sabacūs*, or *Sava of Cush*, and since the name Sethos seems to have come by a gradual process of abbreviation from Sethosis, Sesoōsis, and Sesog-Chōsis, meaning Sheykh of Cush.

place, having twice risen where he then set, and twice set where he then rose. The explanation of this singular statement is to be found, as has been pointed out by Dr. Hales⁶, in the gradual though slow revolution of the Egyptian year according to the Canicular Cycle, in consequence of the omission of the intercalation of a day in the fourth year. So that in process of years the winter months took the place of the summer months, and the spring months of the autumnal, and still proceeding onwards gradually revolved again to their old position in reference to the seasons. The month in which the sun rose with the star Sirius would thus when *half* that cycle was accomplished be reversed, and in the revolution of another *full* cycle the same reversal would have taken place again. And the time required by the statement of the priests (which Herodotus has obscurely rendered, as one who did not understand it) would thus be not more than a Canicular Cycle and a half, that is, $1461 + 730\frac{1}{2}$, = $2191\frac{1}{2}$ years, which measured back from the time of Herodotus, say B.C. 456, would conduct to about B.C. 2647, a date somewhat later than the death of the patriarch Salah the father of Peleg, and so far not very extravagant; but which must be taken only as a *general* statement, with considerable latitude; for it is a hundred and forty years earlier than the date which we shall afterwards show⁷ to be deducible from Manetho and Diodorus for the beginning of the kingdom of Menes. The measure given by the priests to Herodotus, from its peculiar nature, might,

⁶ “Analysis of Chronology,” 2nd edit. 8vo, vol. i. p. 39. Mr. R. S. Poole, who follows the same view, appears not to have been aware that he had been anticipated in it.

⁷ See below, Chap. X. Sec. i.

without any imputation, be vague and inaccurate to this extent.

Thus of this vast succession of Thirty-year Periods mentioned by Diodorus, though each is the space of a human generation, all are transparently theoretical; and their allotment to any actual human occupants is purely mythical, excepting only the periods assigned to the fifty-two native successors of Menes, and the four Ethiopians, which are together 1436 years. There are, however, other historical measures related to these, which we shall find authority for; namely, 135 years for the Persian dynasty, mentioned in the same passage of Diodorus; and from another source 443 years, or about the measure of fifteen generations, perhaps including the reign of Menes himself. These three added together amount to 2014 years. Prefixing to them a grand Soli-lunar Cycle of 532 generations, 15,960 years, we obtain 17,974 years, or, in Diodorus's expression, "a little short of 18,000 years." With that theoretical cycle to work upon, nothing was easier for them than to get up great periods. The "not quite 18,000 years," so obtained, could easily be all assigned to the gods and heroes, and prefixed to the theoretical 4700 years of Julian time mentioned by Diodorus, or, to round the number, why not say, as he does elsewhere, about 5000? And thus there comes out Diodorus's other mythical number of 23,000 years. When a grand theoretical succession of years like the Julian Period, or its double, was once set up, they could of course play with it, with the satisfaction of knowing that the eternal flow of time actually existed, with its supposed years and thirty-year periods as mapped out, whether there were men in them or not. Gods and demigods could be

had recourse to, if there were not men; or the sun and the moon might be supposed to rule the vacant spaces with the sceptre and insignia of Osiris and Isis. Mythically viewed, their offspring Horus was treated as a personification of the year⁸; and in the fable of Isis seeking and recovering the scattered members of Osiris, and Horus avenging his father's death and putting down Typhon, is contained an allegory of the Egyptian doctrine of the παλιγγενεσία, the putting down Death and Destruction by Time and the recovering hand of Nature⁹.

It is clear that the cycle of which we have indicated the traces, depending necessarily on the Solar Cycle of the Julian year, was comparatively modern in the days of Diodorus: for the old *Egyptian* year was the same with the Nabonassarean, consisting of 365 days without the quadrennial intercalation; and

⁸ Diodorus (lib. i. c. 26) tells us that by some of the Greeks the year is called "Horus," and annual chronicles "Horographies." παρ' ἐνίοις τῶν Ἑλλήνων τοὺς ἐναντοὺς ὥρους καλεῖσθαι καὶ τὰς κατ' ἔτος ἀναγραφὰς ὥρογραφίας προσαγορεύεσθαι. Wesseling, in a note on the place, cites in support of this statement Censorinus "De Die Natali," 19: "Sunt qui tradunt hunc annum trimestrem Horum instituisse, eoque ver, aestate, autumnum, hiemem ὥρας et annum ὥρον dici, et Græcos annales ὥρους, eorumque scriptores ὥρογράφους." Which he supports from Plutarch, T. ii. p. 677 D, where Antipater says, τοὺς μὲν ἐναντοὺς ἀρχαῖκῶς ὥρους λέγεσθαι, and also by reference to Athenæus, x. p. 423 f, to Hesychius, Eustathius, and the rest of the grammarians, explaining Homer's ἐννέωρον δάριστὴν and ἐννέωρον ἀλειφαρ; and to Hesychius in the word Ὦρογράφοι, &c. We shall find proof by and by that the king by whom the year of 365 days was introduced had also the name of Horus. It is to be carefully observed that the mythical application of these or other personages by the Egyptians does not exclude, but rather is based on, their historical existence also as persons, though thus parabolically transferred to a totally different meaning.

⁹ Diodor. i. 21.

the cycle belonging to it was the Canicular, which was in use in Manetho's days. It follows that such parts of those periods of Diodorus as were at all ancient, are, if incorporated with the Julian chronology, transferred to it from a different computation ; and may therefore bear traces of incongruity in the fitting in. This, it will be found, is the case with the fifty-two generations of successors of Menes ; which are introduced by Diodorus in a dislocated manner, after mention of the 475 sovereigns who were, as we have seen, plainly all invented to make out with them the soli-lunar number of 532 generations, or Thirty-year periods.

We shall now investigate the nature of those fifty-two successions and trace them to their place in Manetho's grand scheme of Chronology. The transference of them from the earlier Sothic Chronology, to the Julian Soli-lunar, has apparently confused Diodorus as to their historical nature and place : and, after mentioning their total number and duration, he proceeds to give many of the historical details of the period and succession, in such a manner that his reader is led into the mistake of supposing them to be details, not of that, but of a subsequent period. Whether Diodorus himself altogether fell into this mistake may be doubtful, because he is relating the statements which he had met with in books ; and, as his style is not always distinguished by great precision, the expression "*after these things*," with which he introduces the historical details of the succession, may not mean "*after the expiry* of the 1400 years of the fifty-two generations," but only "*after the general mention* of them in the books¹." These details no doubt

¹ This may be illustrated by one of the fragments of Diodorus

were given after that general statement of the time and number of generations, and that most probably in the books of Manetho, which were the most accessible, being in Greek, as well as by far the most celebrated; but they are in fact not a subsequent time and series of generations, but the detailed account of the same, as we shall plainly prove.

himself, from Book vi. (Wesselink's edition, fol. 1746, vol. ii. p. 633), mentioning Euemerus's account of his voyage to the island Pankhaia, where he said he had seen a temple of Zeus Triphylæus, founded by that person himself, while yet upon earth, when he reigned over the whole world; in which temple there was a golden column, whereon were inscribed in Pankhaic characters the transactions of URANUS, and KRONUS, and ZEUS, in a brief summary; and *after these things* he says that URANUS first became king, &c., ἐν ἦ τοῖς Παγχαίοις γράμμασιν ὑπάρχειν γεγραμμένας τὰς τε Οὐρανοῦ καὶ Κρόνου καὶ Διὸς πράξεις κεφαλαιωδῶς, μετὰ ταῦτα φησι πρῶτον Οὐρανὸν βασιλέα γεγονέναι, &c. Will any one maintain that there is here a *second* Uranus mentioned; and that, in the summing of the time, the reign of the second Uranus and all the events following it should be *added* to the sum of the reigns of Uranus, Kronus, and Zeus?

CHAPTER III.

OF THE EGYPTIAN HISTORICAL PERIODS OF DIODORUS.—THE ACCOUNT GIVEN BY HIM OF THE FIFTY-TWO DESCENDANTS OF MENES, WHO REIGNED UPWARDS OF 1400 YEARS.

IT is scarcely necessary to bespeak the reader's patience for the details which follow. The importance of the issue depending may counter-balance the dryness of the process by which it must be reached. That issue will be found to be the demonstration of the utter falsity of the chronological statements by which men, who are glorified beyond desert as literary and scientific, have been assailing the facts of the Scripture history. We may set out by taking a text from Diodorus.

“They say that, after the gods, Mēnas was the first who reigned over the Egyptians. And in succession it is said that descendants of the above mentioned king, two and fifty in all, reigned more than 1400 years, in whose time nothing worthy of record took place.” Diodor. i. 45.

Diodorus seems here to have mistaken the inference to be drawn from the absence of any record, in *that particular place* of the priestly books which he was consulting, concerning that long line and immense period. He himself had mentioned at the close of the preceding chapter, that the priests had

an exact account of all their kings, their stature, character, and the occurrences of their reigns. Is it credible that 1400 years should be an utter blank? No: he himself has found (though it seems he was not aware of it) and has even supplied to us, the record, beginning with Bousiris and his eight descendants. In short all the native kings of Egypt were accounted successors of Menês, and the generations of the successors of Menês were numbered fifty-two, apart from fifteen separately counted, as we shall see. Before proceeding however with these, we may turn to one or two general facts which Diodorus furnishes as belonging to the period, whether during or following the close of this long succession. These are furnished by him in the forty-fourth chapter, immediately preceding.

He there mentions that among the kings there were four Ethiopians, who reigned, not in succession, but with an interval, for a little less than six-and-thirty years in all. Then he proceeds to the Persian dominion, by which the whole native succession was superseded.

“ But the Persians,” says he, “ held the dominion from the conquest of the nation by king Cambyses a hundred and thirty-five years; besides¹ the revolts

¹ στύ. These revolts must be taken in addition to the 135 years. The allowance necessary to be made for them appears, according to the Canon of Ptolemy (which gives 194 years from the 5th year of Cambyses to the close of the Persian dominion), to be in all about 59 years. According to the list ascribed to Africanus it was *more*, without including the revolt in the close of the reign of Darius the son of Hystaspes, which was subdued in the second year of Xerxes, or the revolt of Inarus, which lasted four years, but confining the reckoning to the periods of acknowledged independence in the native reign of Amyrtæus and of his son and successor Pausiris; and the native reigns of Achoris,

of the Egyptians, which they made from their in-

Psammuthis, Nopheritus, Nectanebes, Tachus, Mendes, and Nectanebus.

The list ascribed to Africanus furnishes us with the reckoning of this period, not exactly in agreement with Diodorus's reckoning, but yet very illustrative of it:—

THE TWENTY-SEVENTH DYNASTY. EIGHT KINGS. PERSIAN.

1. Cambyses	reigned over Egypt, counting from the 3rd year of his reign over the Persians.	6 years.
2. Darius, the son of Hystaspes	36 "
3. Xerxes the Great	21 "
4. Artabanes, seven months.		
5. Artaxerxes	41 "
6. Xerxes, two months.		
7. Sogdianus, seven months.		
8. Darius, the son of Xerxes	16 "

Together 120 years and 4 months.

THE TWENTY-EIGHTH DYNASTY. ONE KING. SAITE.

1. Amyrtæus ¹ , the Saite	6 years.
--------------------------------------	----------	----------

THE TWENTY-NINTH DYNASTY. FOUR KINGS. MENDESIAN.

1. Nekherites ²	6 years.
2. Akhoris ³	13 "
3. Psammuthis	1 "
4. Nopherites, four months.		—

Together 20 years.

THE THIRTIETH DYNASTY. THREE KINGS. SEBENNITE.

1. Nectanebes ⁴	18 years.
2. Teos ⁵	2 "
3. Nectanebôs ⁶	18 "

Together 38 years.

[OVER

¹ Not mentioned by Diodorus, xi. 71. See Herod. iii. 15, and Syncel. Chronogr.

² Called Νεφερίτης, Euseb. "Chron. Can." p. 172; Νεφερεύς, Diodor. xiv. 79.

³ Ακόρης, Diodor. xv. 9.

⁴ Νεκτάνεβης, Diodor. xv. 42.

⁵ Ταχός, Diodor. xv. 90.

⁶ Νεκτανεβώς, Diodor. xv. 92, xvi. 41. Pseudo-Callisth. i. 1, 34; ii. 26.

ability to endure the harshness of the oppression, and the impiety towards the gods of their country.

“Last of all, the Macedonians ruled, and the successors of the Macedonians, two hundred and seventy-six years.” Diodor. i. 44.

This extends down to the time when Diodorus visited Egypt in the 180th Olympiad, when Ptolemy Auletes was king, as he tells us. The 180th Olympiad began b.c. 60 and ended b.c. 57. Diodorus appears to have come to Egypt at the beginning of it, b.c. 60, as Clinton shows; but he was occupied thirty years on his history, and was still writing till after the death of Julius Cæsar, b.c. 44 (see Clinton, “Fasti Hellen.” vol. iii. p. 211). Ptolemy Auletes was first recognized by the Romans b.c. 59 (Clinton, F. H. vol. iii. p. 393). Alexander the Great succeeded his father Philip b.c. 336. He crossed the Hellespont b.c. 334. Alexandria was founded by him b.c. 332. Darius, the last king of Persia, was slain b.c. 330. Diodorus in one place dates to Alexander’s passage of the Hellespont, and in another measures the same period of time to the founding of Alexandria². Two hundred and seventy-six years measured from these

THE THIRTY-FIRST DYNASTY. THREE KINGS. PERSIAN.

1. Ochus, in the 20th year of his reign in Persia	6 years.
2. Arses, the son of Ochus	4 ”
3. Darius, whom Alexander conquered	6 ”
	—

Together 16 years.

In all giving to the Persians 136 years and 4 months,
And to the periods of independence 64 years.

Total 200 years.

Which is longer than the reckoning in Ptolemy’s Canon by at least four years.

² Compare lib. i. c. 23, and c. 26.

events would give respectively B.C. 58, B.C. 56, or B.C. 54, as the date down to which Diodorus in this place had reckoned, and any of these would sufficiently agree with the general facts; but the second, at the close of B.C. 57, or commencement of B.C. 56, that is, at the *close* of the 180th Olympiad, which would thus be *included* in the reckoning in this passage, seems to be the most likely.

Some decisive light, it is hoped, may be thrown upon the measure of time allotted in the above extract to the fifty-two descendants of Menes, and upon the epoch down to which it reaches. In records applying to that remote time it is obvious that there might be, and indeed is, a liability to fit together the chronology of one scheme of the history, with facts, historical or traditionary, belonging to another scheme of it; and though both may be substantially true, the effect of a mistake in the adjustment of them to one another may be to shift the same man several generations forward or back in the history. If this should have happened in regard to Menes (and happened it certainly has, since Eusebius has removed him so far back as to bring him into coincidence with Mizraim), the error may or may not admit of being historically rectified; but in examining the measures of time, Menes may here be considered simply as the letter A, B, or C, marking, according to Diodorus, the beginning of fifty-two generations. In regard to the measure of the fifty-two generations it will be unimportant whether the historical person Menes really occupied that place, or whether some generations have been omitted between him and the beginning of the fifty-two, or in the course of that succession. There is, as we shall find, some very doubtful indication of this, in

the apparent repetition of Bousiris and his eight descendants³, which would accord with the idea of a period of some generations before the commencement of that main series.

In the details with which Diodorus follows his general statement of the fifty-two descendants of Menès who reigned in succession, not all are enumerated. He begins with the mention of a dynasty of nine kings, namely, Bousiris and his eight descendants; of whom the last bore the same name with his ancestor; and, after some particulars of the works executed by that king, somewhat discursively treated of in several chapters, he mentions again Bousiris and his eight descendants, of whom the eighth bore after his ancestor the patronymic name of Ukhoreus (*Οὐχορεύς*)⁴. It may be concluded therefore that Bousiris also bore that name, which

³ Diodor. i. 45, 50.

⁴ Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα, κατασταθέντος βασιλέως Βουσίριδος, καὶ τῶν τούτου πάλιν ἐκγόνων ὀκτὼ, τὸν τελευταῖον ὄμώνυμον ὅντα τῷ πρώτῳ φασὶ κτίσαι τὴν ὑπὸ μὲν Αἴγυπτίων καλούμενην Διὸς πόλιν τὴν μεγάλην, ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν Ἑλλήνων Θήβας. Diodor. i. 45.

Τὸν δὲ τούτου τοῦ βασιλέως ἀπογόνων ὅγδοος, ὁ ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς προσαγορευθεὶς Οὐχορεύς, ἔκτισε πόλιν Μέμφιν, ἐπιφανεστάτην τῶν κατ’ Αἴγυπτον, &c. i. 50.

We have here, first, a series of nine kings, *first and last* bearing the royal designation of Bousiris, and by the last of whom Thebes was built. Again, starting from the ninth Bousiris, we seem to have eight descendants from him, the eighth bearing, after his ancestor, the name of Ukhoreus; so that the ninth of the first series, if not his predecessors also, bore the patronymic name of Ukhoreus. The last of this second series built Memphis; and from this time, we are informed, Thebes declined in relative importance. Thus Diodorus vaguely and uncertainly, as if he were not quite sure, indicates two series of the name. Nevertheless, it appears to me that here Bousiris and his eight descendants pass only for *nine* of the fifty-two descendants, and are not twice counted.

thus appears to be a recurring one. We may observe that the third of the Egyptian dynasties (according to the list erroneously ascribed to *Africanus*, here in agreement with the evidence of a useful chronological compiler who writes in broken Latin⁵) has the same number of kings, of whom the first is called by the pseudo-*Africanus* *Ekherōphēs*. Now this name on examination will be found to correspond with *Ukhoreus*. For it is well known to those conversant with the Greek language that the termination *euς* arose from the attenuation of a sound analogous to *f* or *ph*⁶; so that the name given by *Diodorus*, *Ukhoreus* (*Oὐχορεύς*) represents only the more attenuated pronunciation of *Ukhō-rephs*, which seems the same with that written by the pseudo-*Africanus*, *Ekherōphēs* (*Ἐχερόφης*). The rest of the list has been made up from names of a later epoch.

It seems probable that the word *Ekhérōphēs* has

⁵ Scaliger entitles the work “*Excerpta utilissima ex priore libro chronologico Eusebii, et Africani, et aliis, latine conversa ab homine barbano, inepto, Hellenismi et Latinitatis imperitissimo.*” It will be found at large in Scaliger’s *Thesaurus Temporum, Amstelodami*, 1658; and the passage quoted is at p. 75. Eusebius’s *Chronica*, Greek and Latin, with the Greek *Sozomena* of the first part, *Africanus*’s dynasties of *Manetho* (or those which pass under that name), an excellent chronological collection entitled *Ιστοριῶν Συναγωγὴ*, with other ancient works, and some treatises of Scaliger’s on chronology, will be found in this invaluable treasury.

The barbarous Latin extracts are noticed, but not given at large, in Mueller’s “*Fragm. Hist. Gr.*”

⁶ “Substantives in *euς* and *auς* have been introduced among the *pure* roots only by the attenuation of the *f*: (*βασιλεύς, ναῦς*) *βασιλεὺς, ναῦς*.” Thiersch, “*Greek Gram.*,” Sir D. K. Sandford’s translation, p. 119. The modern Greeks, and after them Reuchlin and those who adhere to his pronunciation of the ancient Greek, sound the diphthongs *eu* and *au*, as *ef* and *af*. *Ibid.* p. 40.

suffered a transposition of two of its consonants, and ought to be written *Erékhōphēs*, that is, “*of the city of Erech*,” which was one of the first beginnings of the kingdom of Nimrod, the son of Cush (Gen. x. 10). This city, in the formation of the derived name of its people, assumed a *v*, and they were called *Erekhvæ* or *Arkh'vites* (Heb. אֶרְחָבִת, LXX Ἀρχυαῖοι, Vulg. *Erchuæi*; Ezra iv. 9). The city of Erech, or Orech (*Ὀρέχ*) as the Septuagint has it, was in the land of Shinar; and the Hebrew writing of the name of its people seems to me to point towards an identification of it with Urchoa, or Orchoë, on the Euphrates, some distance below Babylon; a city celebrated for a peculiar foreign, probably Egyptian, sect of astronomers and astrologists, by which an ancient connexion of it with Egypt may be marked⁷.

⁷ Bochart (*Phaleg*. lib. iv. c. 16) would identify Erech with the Arecca of Ptolemy, the Arecha of Ammianus, and the Ardericca of Herod. vi. 119, which last he interprets *Ard-Erica* or *Ard-Erecha*, “The great Erech.” This distinctive epithet may imply that there were two Erechs. Dean Stanley makes Edessa the other (*Lectures on the Jewish Church*, p. 6). In the place cited, Herodotus states that Ardericca was 210 stadia from Susa (qu. from the Susian boundary on the Tigris?), and in the territory of the Kissians (qu. here Chasdim, or Chaldeans, then subject to the same government with Susiana?). In his first book (c. 185) Herodotus mentions Ardericca, probably the same, and it was certainly *not east* of the Tigris. “Nitocris,” says he, “led the Euphrates, hitherto straight, by a tortuous course, so that it came three times in three days’ navigation to the same village, named Ardericca.” One of these Erechs was Urchoa, of which the modern name, *Arja*, may even retain a vestige of the syllable *Ard*, from *Ard-Erecha*. The passage last quoted, which continues thus, καὶ νῦν οἱ ἄν κομίζωνται ἀπὸ τῆσδε τῆς θαλάσσης ἐς Βαβυλῶνα καταπλέοντες ἐς τὸν Εὐφράτην ποταμὸν, τρίς τε ἐς τὴν αὐτὴν ταύτην κώμην παραγίνονται, καὶ ἐν τρισὶ ἡμέρησι,—might at first sight seem to require the reading ἀναπλέοντες for καταπλέοντες; but not so:

The span of time of the two first of the Egyptian dynasties as represented in the lists ascribed respectively to Eusebius and Africanus, and also by the broken Latin Chronologist, is given with more or less inaccuracy; but they contain fifteen generations of descendants of Menès; and, as we shall afterwards find, the first fifteen generations are separated from all the rest by Manetho, as a marked chronological measure, in a manner that might easily lead to their being left out of the account by Diodorus.

With the formation of Erekhōphēs, as a derivative from Nimrod's city Erech, may be compared the formation of the name *Memphis* from Mēn or Mēnēs its founder;—*Men-phis*⁸. There is also a similar formation of the derivative name of another of Nimrod's cities with the letter *v* or *ı*, answering also to *φ* in *Memphis*; namely, Nineveh (נִינָה), Nîn 'veh, from Nîn or Ninus: most likely meaning originally

for the latter word may be taken simply for sailing towards land. The sense in any case here requires this meaning; and, while no man could sail *down* from the Mediterranean sea *into* the Euphrates, he might sail from the Persian gulf into it, and might very well be said to sail *down* from the high sea into the Euphrates. For *καταπλέειν* is the common phrase to express sailing towards land, steering towards port; as Scapula gives it, *navigando descendere, navi devehi in terram*. Schweighaeuser thinks that *ἀπὸ τῆσδε τῆς θαλάσσης* means “from the Mediterranean;” but this, though the expression is so used by Herodotus occasionally, cannot be conclusive where it makes nonsense of the passage. If necessary *τῆσδε* had better be rejected than *ἐς* before *τὸν Εὐφράτην*, which he proposes. The object of Nitocris also being the defence of Babylon, suits the supposition of the winding course being below, not above the city; so as to retard the approach of any naval attack from the sea, and furnish the means of frustrating it in the passage.

⁸ ΦI Sermone *Æg.* denotat *τηρεῖν, servare, custodire*, Matt. ix. 17. *Jablonski, Voces Æg.* ap. Stephani “Thesaur. Ling. Gr.” Valpy’s edit.

the keep of Nin or Ninus, so called after its founder Nin-Merod, “The revolted or Apostate Son,” or “The son of the chase;” or, by a paronomasia such as was frequent in names, “Nin, or Ninus, the Subduer;” according as the second portion of the name is taken from פָּרַד to rebel, from רָא to rove or to pursue, or from תַּדְּרָה to tread down, to subdue. The two parts of the name Nin-Merod, or Nimrod, have left their separate traces, the former in the names *Ninus* and *Nineveh*, and the latter in the frequent Babylonian name *Merodach*, in which last the termination may arise from composition with the Chaldee demonstrative pronoun דְּהָ (dekh), as it were *Venator ille*, “The mighty hunter.”

The name Erekhōphēs has undergone other transformations, chiefly by prefixing the initial N, for the name *Nin*, or an abbreviation of it. Eusebius, or the writer from whom we have the account of Manetho’s dynasties contained in the Greek Sozomena of Eusebius’s Chronica, writes it *Nekherōkhis*, and the broken Latin chronological compiler above cited, *Necherocheus*: the principal difference, besides the prefixing of N, being the interchange of *ph* with *kh*; of which interchange of the aspirated letters other instances occur among the names⁹.

According to the broken Latin chronologist just mentioned, Menēs was followed in succession by seven descendants: then came another succession of eight kings¹: then Necherocheus (Ekherōphēs), who was followed in succession by other eight.

⁹ An instance has just occurred (p. 69, note) in the interchange, of the name Nepheritēs with Nekheritēs, and another will be found in the variation of Phiops with Kheops.

¹ According to the lists attributed to Africanus and Eusebius, the number of kings of the second dynasty was nine. The broken-

Now the name Ekherophs or Ukhorephs, we have found, was borne by a king who is also called Busiris or Bousiris (*Βούσιρις*), and this last name has evidently some relation to Osiris. The name is probably the same with that which is given to one of the later kings, the son of Amyrtaeus, in the modified form “Pausiris.” The diphthong in the first syllable in both cases indicates a contraction; and a contraction might easily be formed from the dropping of the liquid *l* in Baal or Bel², Baal-Osir', Ba'-Osir, and with a Greek termination added Bausiris or Bousiris, according as predominance might be given to the former or latter vowel in the pronunciation. The name in short is of the same origin and composition with Pul-assur. I would suggest therefore that this name signifies “Lord of Asshur or Assyria³,” and that it is a name appropriately

Latin extracts support the true scheme of Manetho, by giving a succession of fifteen in the two dynasties together; and with this Diodorus agrees.

² The slurring or omission of the liquid *l* may be illustrated in the change of Melek into Mak, for which see Lepsius, *Egypt, Ethiopia, and Sinai*, p. 182 (Bohn, 1853).

³ The name Osiris is interpreted, very consistently with the idea of “THE GREAT KING,” “MANY-EYED;”—μεθερμηνευομένων μὲν γὰρ τούτων εἰς τὸν Ἑλληνικὸν τῆς διαλέκτου τρόπον, εἶναι τὸν μὲν Ὀσιριν πολυόφθαλμον. Diodor. i. 11. Compare c. 13, τὸν μὲν Οσιριν μεθερμηνεύομενον εἶναι Διόνυσον. These two differing interpretations show that the rendering is not to be understood as drawn close to the letter; and “THE MANY-EYED” suggests the fact that the satraps and other functionaries of the great Oriental monarchies were considered “the eyes and ears of the great king.” ὡσπερ μεγάλον βασιλέως ὀφθαλμοὶ καὶ ὄτα, Philo “De Somn.” Opp. edit. Mangey. Lon. 1742, vol. i. p. 642. Xenophon applies the idea to the Persian, the successor of the Assyrian (Osirian?) monarchy:—κατερμάθομεν δὲ ὡς καὶ τοὺς βασιλέως καλούμενους ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ τὰ βασιλέως ὄτα, &c. Xen. “Cyrop.” viii. p. 468.

applicable to Nimrod, the founder of Erech, who went out of that land *into Assyria*, and founded Nineveh. Being thus a title of dominion or honour, it became assumed by the Egyptian successors of that first imperial head of the Cushite or Hamite tribes, after it had ceased to be strictly applicable. The Bousiris therefore whom we have found to be also called Ukhorephs, has in the latter name the same title with the king who, in the lists of the dynasties attributed to Manetho, is the sixteenth in succession of the descendants of Menês. Whether he was correctly so reckoned is another question. Perhaps some vestige of Manetho's information might be found incorporated there, though the whole dynasty were not to be depended on, but had been fabricated by fraud or error on that slight foundation. Of the first fifteen human generations of Manetho there is little if any thing given beyond a certain measure of time. As to the persons by whom that period was filled, or even their names, it will be found afterwards that the lists of the first sixteen successive dynasties which pass under the assumed names of Africanus and Eusebius are fabricated out of names taken generally, from a later period of the Egyptian history; nay, are indeed mere varying versions of the eighteenth dynasty: but at present we are not concerned with that question, which would here interrupt our consideration of Diodorus's account of the succession.

We have noticed a vagueness in that historian's statement of the first nine kings, Bousiris and his eight descendants, of whom the last was called after his great ancestor, Urkhoæus; as if he felt not sure whether the series were not repeated in other eight, of whom the last bore also the title of Urkhoæus.

This want of precision may indicate some consciousness on the part of the historian that there were other generations to be allowed for as belonging to the series, but an uncertainty whether in that place. It is only necessary to remark that if this be so, it probably arises from the fact already noticed, of there being fifteen generations separated from the rest by Manetho, which must be taken in addition to the time expressed in the succession of the fifty-two generations. But, on a careful comparison of the several documents, these fifteen are not, either in part or in whole, to be prefixed to the series of Diodorus, but create an acknowledged break of ages (*χρόνων πολλῶν διάστημα*) in the course of it. This will appear as we proceed.

We must leave that question for the present, remarking only on the name given to the first king. Menès is also written Mēnas, and Mēn, and with an iota Minēs¹ or Mineus². The form with iota corresponding to Mēn would be Mīn. This may be nothing more than a variation of dialect from Nin³, or Ninus; and thus, as far as the name goes, he may be the same with Nin-Merod, or Nimrod,—Bausiris or Ba'Osir, “the lord of Asshur,”—Erekh-ōphēs or Erekhōvi, “the founder of Erech,”—the founder also of Nineveh, and of another Nin-vi,

¹ Μετραίμ ὁ καὶ Μίνης.—Αθώθης νὶὸς Μίνεως. Euseb. Chron. lib. i. apud Scaligeri “Thesaur. Tempor.” (pp. 17, 18 of the Greek.)

² “Excerpta Chronologica.” Scalig. “Thesaur. Temp.” p. 74.

³ Compare, for the interchange of *m* and *n* in dialect, the familiar pronominal particles *μιν* and *νιν*. An illustration more directly in point may be found in the fact that, while Minēs or Mēn gave his name to Memphis, as Sir George Cornwall Lewis confesses, that city is called by Isaiah, Noph (ch. xix. 3), and by Hosea, Moph (ch. ix. 6, Heb.). Here the interchange of the letters seems actually to be in the name of Min or Nin.

Min-vi, or Men-phis in Egypt; whence also even one of the sacred Bulls, the emblem of *Osiris*, is mentioned ¹ as having been called *Mνεῦις*, equivalent to M'nephis ², or Men'phi. We also find the word in the same form, *Mνεύης*, applied to the king who first committed the laws to writing ³.

This plurality of names seems thus to admit of unity of person by their careful analysis. How many heroes might be made out of the late illustrious Duke of Wellington, if all the glorious historical titles, which, as many can remember, occupied so considerable a time in reading at his funeral, were treated as separate historical persons! Just so, Nimrod, the first founder of worldly empire, has doubtless left many separate titles of glory floating in the stream of old traditionary history. Eusebius, after Eratosthenes, has given us, as a synonymous name for Menês, the word *Dionius* ⁴; and, as this is not a known name, we may reasonably presume that it is written, by the error of a transcriber, for *Dionysus*, who is without doubt the Egyptian *Osiris*, the same with the traditionary conqueror *Bacchus*; and, as Bochart shows ⁵, that last word is in its

¹ Diodor. lib. i. c. 21. Strabo, xvii.

² The diphthong *eu* is so sounded by the modern Greeks, and their pronunciation was adopted by Reuchlin in the reading of the ancient language. See Thiersch, "Gr. Gram." cited above, p. 73.

³ Diodor. i. 94.

⁴ Θηβαῖων . . . πρῶτος ἐβασίλευσεν Μήνης Θηβιώτης, Θηβαῖος, ὃς ἐρμηνεύεται Διόνιος ἢ η ξβ'. Euseb. Chron. lib. i. (In Scaliger's "Thesaurus Temporum," p. 18 of the Greek.) By some Διόνιος has been conjectured to be miswritten for Αἴνιος, but there is no proof that either was a name of Menês, or expressed the meaning of the word.

⁵ Bochart, "Phaleg." lib. i. c. 2, 18. See also my work "Isaiah's Testimony for Jesus," Appendix, pp. 540—548.

origin BAR-CHUS, by interpretation “THE SON OF CUSH,” in fact, no other than NIMROD; whence, appropriately to THE MIGHTY HUNTER, Bacchus is represented as having yoked tigers to his chariot.

We may follow, then, for the present, the shortest reckoning of the successions, leaving out the questionable repetition of the eight, and take the first Bousiris and his eight descendants only once, as properly Menês himself and the first eight successors, the eighth being Ukhoreus. But as the first Bousiris appears to be here counted in the succession, Ukhoreus is thus the ninth. To him, on this view, Diodorus ascribes the building of Diospolis, or Thebes, in Upper Egypt³, or, it might be, its rebuilding and improving; for some, he tells us, attributed the building of it to Osiris⁴. To Ukhoreus also he ascribes the building of Memphis, near the apex of the Delta, where the Nile divides.

This king was followed, according to Diodorus, by twelve generations of kings, and then came Moeris⁵, who may thus be counted the twenty-first from Bousiris, or, including Bousiris himself, the twenty-second; and who was followed by *seven generations* of kings not named⁶, making down to the close of this time, twenty-nine generations, inclusive of the first Bousiris. Then followed Sesoösis, or Sesostris, who is thus the thirtieth.

If the Moeris who is placed twenty-second by Diodorus were, for the moment, supposed the same who is said by Herodotus, according to the account of the priests, to have died less than nine hundred years previously to the time when they gave him the information, it may be observed that nine hundred

³ Lib. i. 50.

⁵ Lib. i. 51.

⁴ Lib. i. 15.

⁶ Lib. i. 53.

years are equivalent to thirty generations, or thirty *Thirty-year Periods*; and that thirty generations added to the twenty-two which we have counted as ending in Moeris, would complete the fifty-two generations of successors of Menês. It is possible that the round number of about nine hundred years given by the priests may have been roughly arrived at in this manner; and that they had counted the succession down to the conquest of Cambyses, b.c. 526, when the native line ceased for a long time, and continued in abeyance to the days of Herodotus. Thirty generations so counted previous to that conquest would carry back the death of Moeris to about b.c. 1426. Probably the date ought to be at least fifteen generations, or *Thirty-year Periods*, higher. There are, however, several kings of the name of Moeris; one of them Sesostris the Great, who took this as one of his names, and who was eight generations later than the king who is here so named by Diodorus; another later still, Mendês, also called *Marrhus* (i. e. *Marês*, or Moeris), who lived in the Polybasileian period of changes, usurpations, and revolutions, which came after Sesoösis II. Their reckoning of the nine hundred years must have been to that last Moeris, and places him correctly in the time later than the Exodus of Israel. But we have mentioned that there are fifteen generations taken *apart* by Manetho, and therefore to be counted *besides* the fifty-two. And their exact position in the succession is not determined; for if the fifty-two begin from Menês, then must place be found for the fifteen in the midst or at the close, or partly both. From Diodorus we found it left ambiguous whether or not eight of them were prefixed to the fifty-two, but certain that the whole are not

placed there; and there is reason rather to take them all as supplying the long interval of ages which he has noted (*πολλῶν χρόνων διάστημα*), which occurred soon after the builders of the pyramids. The estimate of the priests to Herodotus may have been given by them overlooking this.

In the list of *Theban* kings by Eratosthenes and Apollodorus, as it is given by Scaliger, a king Marēs, who might, from his name, be taken to be the same who is here counted twenty-second in the general order, is placed *ninth*, and is accompanied by a note from Eusebius, that it was in the time of the sixteenth dynasty among the Egyptians, in which Thebans reigned for 160, or in some copies 190, years⁷. The Theban dynasty here referred to is to

⁷ Θηβαίων Αἰγυπτίων ἐβασίλευσεν θ' Μάρης, νιὸς αὐτοῦ, ὃ ἐστιν Ἡλιοδωρος, ἔτη κε'; to which there is appended this remark, παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις ἐτύχανεν ις' δυναστεία καθ' ἣν ἐβασίλευσαν Θηβαῖοι ἔτη ρξ, ἐν τισι δὲ ἀντιγράφοις ργ'. Scalig. "Thesaur. Temp." Gr. p. 18. Syncellus, in our present copies of his Chronography since the edition of Goarus, does not give this note in the same place with the list of Eratosthenes. In some of the less doctored manuscripts used by Scaliger (see above, Chap. I. p. 32.) it seems to have been found. See his notes, p. 413. It is given by Bunsen in a *Laterculus Regum Aegyptiacorum*, which he has put together from successive parts of Syncellus ("Egypt's Place in Univ. Hist." vol. i. p. 685, *Engl. Tr.*); and he states that it is found, expressly as a quotation from Eusebius, in the margin of the manuscripts of Syncellus A and B, against the year of the world γρμε' (3145):—Ἐνσέβιος φησιν ὅτι παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις, &c. The year of the world here mentioned would make the marginal passage correspond, according to Syncellus, not so much to the ninth Theban king in the list of Eratosthenes, as more generally to the sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth of those kings, whom Syncellus places from the year of the world 3090 to 3205. And these years of the world, according to the same Syncellus, correspond to the Egyptian kings of his *Laterculus* from the tenth onward nearly to the seventeenth. The last of these is Ousē, and his date, according

be understood as the same dynasty which, before the arrival of the Shepherds, reigned over all Egypt, which continued at Thebes during the reign of the Shepherds in Lower Egypt, and which recovered Egypt from the Shepherds; on which it became in Lower Egypt the *eighteenth* dynasty, as succeeding

to Syncellus, is put thirty-one years later than Marêš. But all these years of the world are of Syncellus's fixing, not of ancient authority. Goarus, who first edited Syncellus, has a list of passages of that author, amended by Scaliger, and also of passages alleged to be vitiated by him; in the latter of which he places this, in the following manner:—Μάρης νὺς αὐτοῦ δὲ ἑστιν Ἡλιόδωρος, post hæc de suo subdit, παρ' Αἰγυπτίους ἐτίγχανεν τοὺς δυναστείας καθ' ἣν ἐβασίλευσαν Θηβαῖοι ἐτη ρεῖ: ἐν τοις δὲ ἀντιγράφοις ρῃ'. Fallitur Scaliger; Mosis enim temporibus Dynastia 16 proxima fuit, hæcque a Mari, qui anno 3205 regnare cœpit, annis fere 600 cernitur remota (vid. Georg. Syncel. "Chron." ed. Dindorf. Bonn, vol. ii. p. 323). The reason here assigned by Goarus for rejecting the passage is merely connected with his own theory of chronology, with which it did not agree; but that had nothing to do with the question of its *genuineness*, nor afforded any sufficient ground for imputing to Scaliger the invention of it. Scaliger, in his notes on the Greek of Eusebius, p. 413, refers to it, not as if guilty; and the passage itself even refers to the existence of two various readings, in several different copies; nay, on a frivolous accusation of Syncellus's, Scaliger treats this sixteenth dynasty as having been forged by Eusebius. Dindorf, the more recent editor of Syncellus, speaks of *Goarus*, as "Scaligeri obtrectator acerrimus, mediocri homo doctrina, artis criticæ facultate nulla, negligentia incredibili" (præf. ed. Bonn). In these circumstances the subsequent disappearance of the passage, or its source not having been stated by Scaliger, involves no suspicion upon him. In the very commencement of the Chronicus Canon of Eusebius are these words, following the mention of the birth of Abraham. "Porro apud Ægyptios, XVI. potestas erat, quam vocant dynastiam. Ab hoc tempore regnabant eis Thebæi annos CXC." This is so far corroborative evidence of one of the readings mentioned by Scaliger. It also contradicts the statement of Goarus, that the sixteenth dynasty was next to the days of Moses. See my table of the Manethonian Chronology in Chap. X. sec. i.

the *seventeenth* or Shepherd dynasty there. The 190 or 160 years here mentioned were contemporary with the Shepherds, as we shall find, and were occupied by five reigns, correctly so given in the sixteenth dynasty of the Manethonian lists ascribed to Eusebius. If, then, that king Marêš, the ninth king of Eratosthenes, reigned in the sixteenth dynasty at Thebes, at the time when the king of that dynasty was reconquering Lower Egypt from the Shepherds, it follows that he *became* the first king of the eighteenth dynasty, who is called Amôsis (the same with Ousê); and it will be found that he was in that case not improbably the same man with the Moeris here mentioned by Diodorus as twenty-second in the general order, or twenty-first after Bousiris. If it was so, these 190 years did not begin at the *birth* of Abraham, as Eusebius thought, but after he left Ur of the Chaldees, while he was at Haran, as will be found on reference to a table to be given below in Chapter X.

Next after the seven blank generations above referred to, Diodorus mentions Sesoösis⁸, or Sesostris the great, who is the eighth to these seven generations, and therefore the thirtieth in the succession, inclusive of the first Bousiris. We may take occasion here to rectify the manifest dislocation of the history which occurs a little afterwards, and which has the absurd effect of placing the building of the three great pyramids from nine to twelve generations after the Trojan War. That war occurred, as we are told by many concurring testimonies, when Egypt was governed by Proteus⁹; and Pro-

⁸ Lib. i. 53.

⁹ Hom. *Od.* iv. Herod. ii. 112—116. Eurip. *Helena*. Diodor. i. 62.

teus is apparently placed by Diodorus about so many generations before the kings who built the Pyramids¹. It is necessary then to remedy this transposition, and to account for it in some manner. The builders of the pyramids must be restored to the period before Proteus and the Trojan War.

Now, after Proteus, Diodorus mentions Remphis², and then seven generations of peaceful kings³, among whom was Nileus, who gave his name to the river, which had previously been called *Ægyptus*, the name which was in use for it in the time of Homer⁴. This little incidental circumstance contributes to show that the septenary of generations to which Nileus belonged was posterior to the Trojan War, and to the age of Homer himself, since the change in the river's name had not occurred before the *Odyssey* was written. These seven generations are then said to have been followed by Khemmis, also called Khembès⁵, expressly numbered as “*the eighth*”⁶, who built the largest of the three great pyramids, and who is the same whom Herodotus calls Kheops. The last name may be the same with

¹ Lib. i. 63.

² Lib. i. 62.

³ c. 63.

⁴ Περπταῖοι δ' Ἀἴγυπτον ἐνέρειτην ικόμεσθα· Στῆσα δ' ἐν Αἴγυπτῳ ποταμῷ νέας ἀμφιελίσσας. Od. §. 257.

⁵ Khemmis is also the name of a city in the Thebaid. The name is probably softened from Khembes, and may be the same represented in Eusebius's list of the kings as Khamois. It is probably from the name Kham, and of the same formation with the names Nin-vi, Min-vi, Erech-vi (Nineveh, Memphis, Orchoë); so Kham-vi, Khem-bes, Kham-oïs, or, by assimilation of the b or v to the preceding m, Khemmis. Khamois is the fourteenth king from Mizraim, in the list of Eusebius. He may be not the same person, though bearing the same name with Khemmis the builder of the Pyramid.

⁶ Diodor. i. 63, ὅγδοος δὲ βασιλεὺς γενόμενος Χέμβης ὁ Μεμφίτης ἦρξε μὲν ἔτη πεντήκοντα.

Phiops⁷ in the sixth dynasty in the received but spurious Manethonian lists;—a king who is there put as the successor of Methu-SUPHIS, and is also succeeded by Menthe-SUPHIS; and who, as belonging to a family of Suphis, may thus turn out to be the same person with Suphis in the fourth dynasty, in the same lists, there stated to have built the greatest of the pyramids, and to have been succeeded by another Suphis. But be that as it may, it is quite manifest that the three great pyramids were not erected so late as from nine to twelve generations after the Trojan War. Diodorus also mentions that the Egyptians were not agreed in their tradition as to them; and, therefore, neither Diodorus nor my reader will be likely to quarrel with me for restoring the builders of the pyramids to the ante-Protean period of Egyptian history, by the simple process of recalling them to their place after the right septenary of blank generations, which Khembès really followed as “the eighth;” instead of taking them after the wrong septenary. We seem to have a trace of the same dislocation in the circumstance that Diodorus mentions Bokkhoris along with or just after them, and then indicates a blank interval of ages between Bokkhoris and Sabacus the Ethiopian⁸, who is said to have burned *one* Bokkhoris alive. But the earlier Bok-khoris, the Khoris or Horus who preceded that interval of ages, must have been another man, the more celebrated of the

⁷ See above, p. 69 *note*, and p. 76. The interchange of Kh with Ph may be found exemplified in the names Nepherites, or Nephereus, also written Nekherites; and Ekherophis, also written Nekherôkhis.

⁸ Πολλοῖς δὲ ὃστερον χρόνοις . . . ἐβασίλευσε τῆς Αἰγύπτου Σαβάκων, lib. i. c. 65.

two; whose illustrious historic name had been assumed by the later but unfortunate native prince, or pretender to the throne, whom Sabacus burned alive. We learn indeed that he was a great king and legislator, who had the honourable surname of “the *Sophi*” or “the wise,” and was called the son of Kneph-Akhthos⁹. These circumstances afford a clue.

Thus Khembê or Kheops, with his son¹ or brother Kephrê, and his son or grandson Mykerinus, also called Mekherinus², seem to come respectively into coincidence, the first with Sesoösis³ who is Sesostris the Great; the second with the son and successor of Sesostris, Rhamses Sesostris II.⁴, sometimes confounded with the brother of Sesostris, Armaïs, whose name is accordingly mentioned in connexion with the pyramid⁵; the third with his son, whom he associated to the throne and who succeeded him, Sesostris III., called by Herodotus simply Pheron⁶, whose reign seems not to have lasted a year after his father’s death. He is not mentioned by Diodorus, but included in his father’s reign and confounded with him, as Sesoösis II. The first of these is probably Bokkhoris “the wise,” the second Bokkhoris “the just,” also called “the wise;” whose

⁹ Diodor. i. 45.

¹ Diodor. i. 64.

² Diodor. i. 64.

³ Diodor. i. 53.

⁴ Diodor. i. 57. 64.

⁵ Diodor. i. 59.

⁶ Herod. ii. 111.

⁷ Compare what is said in praise of Mykerinus, or Menkheres (Μῆν-Χαίρης), Herod. ii. 129, δίκας δέ σφι πάντων δικαιοτάτας κρίνειν. His son Pheron, or Pharaoh, called Menkheres after his father, and taking the title of Sesog-Khosis after his father and grandfather, was on the contrary extremely profligate, and if he was associated to the throne in his father’s life, in consequence of his father’s blindness, may have given that contradictory character to the reign, which we find in Herod. ii. 130—133.

reigns preceded Sabacus by that interval of ages. The resetting of the undeniable dislocation of the order of the history produces this identification of these kings, which will be found to be supported by other facts and justified by sufficient reasons. But if Manetho was the authority whom Diodorus was following, we may expect to find a trace of the same dislocation in Manetho's general scheme, which will be examined in its place.

The reign of the second Sesoösis and his son Pheron,—the former the thirty-first in the succession, the second not counted by Diodorus, but confounded with his father,—was followed by the Polybasileia. In other words, the monarchy became practically dissolved, and the power fell into the hands of many contemporaneous and undistinguished pretenders (*συχνοί τινες τῶν διαδεξαμένων τὴν ἀρχὴν*), of whom Manetho, if he is at all represented in the list attributed to Africanus, tells us that there were seventy who reigned but seventy days⁸. The troubles of the times have produced some confusion of the history. There is mention of

The same story of the impious hurling of his lance against the Nile, which is related by Herodotus of Pheron, is told by Diodorus of Sesoösis II.; and the physical blindness of Sesoösis II., may have pointed the peculiar form of the reproach against the *moral* blindness of the son, whose eyes were afterwards opened, as we shall find. There were thus two Sesostrises of whom blindness was predicated. Diodorus fell into the error of supposing that one of them was Sesostris the Great, from not being aware that there were *three* who in succession bore the name. See below, Chapter IX.

⁸ The seventh dynasty, according to the list given under the name of Africanus. In the list attributed to Eusebius, the *seventy* are reduced to *five*, probably to bring the number to agreement with the persons here actually named in succession Amasis, Actisanes, Marrhus the Mendesian, Proteus, and Remphis.

a king Amasis, also written Amōsis⁹, who attempted to establish himself; but an Ethiopian prince, Actisanes¹, invaded the country, subdued Amōsis, and reigned, but did not transmit the throne to his posterity. At his death that Ethiopian conquest was broken, and gave place to Mendēs, an Egyptian (a clipped form of the name, Ismandēs, or Osymanyas), also called Marrhus² (that is, Marēs or Mōris) after a distinguished historic name; who obtained the throne by the suffrage of his countrymen, and who prepared a tomb for himself in the completion of the building called the Labyrinth, which seems

* Amasis, Amosis, Tethmosis, and Thouthmosis, are apparently varying forms of a recurring name, with or without the name Thoth in combination. Thus Eusebius writes in one place Ἀμωσίς δ καὶ Τέθμωσίς, in naming the thirty-third in his list. *Thesaur. Temp.* p. 23. Apion, in his book against the Jews, is said by Africanus to have placed the Exodus of the Israelites under the reign of Amosis, and contemporary with Inachus. κατὰ Ἰνάχον Ἀργοὺς βασιλέα, Ἀμώσιος Αἰγύπτου βασιλεύοντος, ἀποστῆναι Τονδαίον, ἀν γενέσθαι Μωυσέα. *Thesaur. Temp.* p. 26: see also the author of the Epitomē Chronōn. *Thesaur. Temp.* p. 230. But this was by confusion of the Israelites with the earlier Shepherds. Probably, however, an Amosis was one of the Polybasileia, or many kings who exercised their power contemporaneously, after the overthrow in the Red Sea. The confounding of one of these with the Amasis, or Amosis, who succeeded the last Hophra, and who was the last of the native kings before Cambyses, evidently stumbled Herodotus, when, after mentioning a tradition that one of the pyramids had been built by a courtesan of the name of Rhodopis, who flourished in the reign of Amasis, he observes, that it was not built in this reign, but that Rhodopis flourished very many years later than those kings who built the pyramids (Herod. ii. 134). The woman referred to in that tradition was probably the same called Nitocris and Skemiphiris, who from the description given of her complexion (ξανθὴ τὴν χροιὰν) may very likely have got the appellation of Rhodopis. The king Amasis referred to was probably Rha-Amasis, Rha-Amesses, or RhamesSES the Great.

¹ Diodor. lib. i. c. 60.

² Lib. i. c. 61.

to have been designed and in great part erected by an earlier king or regent, Lakhârê. A sort of republic, with its President or *Proteus*, lasted for some time, and Keten, a man of obscure rank, was elected to the office. The monarchy did not soon recover itself, but the anarchy lasted for *five generations*³. This will bring us to the thirty-sixth royal descent, whether inclusive or not of the whole generations of anarchy; and the frequent revolutionary changes of government, together, perhaps, with some pretensions to magic and divination in Keten, seem to have originated the poetical fable as to the extraordinary transformations of Proteus. But the word Proteus expresses simply *τὸ πρωτεύειν*; that is, it designates him as in rank Primus or President; and the office appears to have been open to plebeian ambition, from what Diodorus tells us of Keten, while he decides that this Keten, a man of low birth, was called Proteus by the Greeks⁴. The five generations of anarchy seem to have been counted either as embracing within them the names of Amosis, Actisanes, Marrhus, Keten and his son Rhemphis, or otherwise as at least not adding to the number and succession of the *kings*. They may be taken as representing about a hundred and fifty years.

In what manner the monarchy again reared itself we have no record. Rhemphis who succeeded his father Keten, might, by some resemblance of the name, present the thought of the Rhampsinitus of Herodotus. But names recur in history; and there was an earlier king so called: for the story told by Herodotus⁵ of the descent of Rhampsinitus to Hades, and his game at dice with Ceres, and her

³ Lib. i. c. 62.

⁴ Diodor. i. 62.

⁵ Herod. ii. 122.

present of the Golden Bowl, suggests the tale of Thoth's game at *dice* (or *calculation*) with the Moon, and his winning from her the seventy-second part of every day, out of which he made the five days called the Epagomenae, by which he completed the year of 365 days⁶, which was legally authorized by Ramesses Osymandyas, and represented in his magnificent Golden Circle.

After Rhemphis, Diodorus places seven generations, among whom was Nileus. These bring the number, previously thirty-six, up to forty-three. Then come the three misplaced kings whom we have already removed and restored to their true position. Nevertheless, as they here occupy the place of three lineal descents, that rectifying of their misplacement and identifying of them with Sesoösis I. and II. and Pheron, must not be allowed to have the effect of striking out three successions from being taken account of in the estimated fifty-two; but we must count three *blank* successions, the error having only consisted in filling them in with wrong names. These therefore bring the number to forty-six.

Tnephakhthos⁷ (Kneph-Akhthos), the father of Bokkhoris “the Sophi,” had been named earlier, but without any indication of his true place in the series; and now Bokkhoris⁸, his son, with a wide space between the mention of the father and the son, and an expressed interval of ages between Bokkhoris and Sabacus the Ethiopian. Whence it may plainly appear, as above remarked, that the Bokkhoris of whom Kneph-Akhthos was father, was a different person from the later prince ordinarily known by that name, who was taken and burnt

⁶ Plut. “De Is. and Osir.” Sir Is. Newton, “Chron.” p. 209.

⁷ Diodor. i. 45.

⁸ i. 65.

alive by Sabacus. The sameness of the recurring name may have had something to do with the confusing of the order. The reckoning of the *number* of the kings is not affected by the question of their exact position in the series ; and Kneph-Akhthos and Bokkhoris would complete the forty-eighth descent, were it not that the Bokkhoris named was identical, as will be found, with Khoris or Horus, a name of Sesostris, who has been already counted ; and therefore his father Kneph-Akhthos was one of the seven preceding Sesostris, and had also been counted. There is therefore only that Bokkhoris to be here reckoned with whom the son of Kneph-Akhthos is generally confounded, but who is a totally distinct person. This makes the number of kings down to this point in the series forty-seven.

Following after the forty-seven generations which have been enumerated, Sabacus is not reckoned, being not a native but an Ethiopian prince ; but Psammiticus, Necho, Psammis⁹, Hophra, and Amasis complete the fifty-two successions¹.

The Dodecarchy, or reign of the twelve contemporaneous kings, is sufficiently represented in Psammiticus, who was one of the twelve before he became

⁹ Diodor. lib. i. 68. Necho and Psammis are not named, but Hophra is mentioned as four generations later than Psammiticus ; that is, reckoning the generations as inclusive of Psammiticus and Hophra ; for the four generations are Psammiticus, Necho, Psammis, and Hophra, who is otherwise called Apries.

¹ The reign of Amasis is counted by Diodorus down to the conquest of Cambyses, Ol. 63. 3 ; equivalent to B.C. 526. Amasis certainly died immediately before that invasion, or just upon its commencement. Diodor. i. 68. Herod. iii. 10. The reign of his son Psammenitus is therefore not counted separately from his according to Diodorus, but fifty-five years are assigned to the reign of Amasis.

sole king; and it is also partly represented in others of the sovereigns who have been mentioned, more particularly it was closely connected with the period and reign of *Sabacu*; the twelve kings having held their contemporaneous power under the Ethiopian suzerainty.

It is probably from confounding this Dodecarchy with the earlier *Polybasileia*, which came after the reign of *Sesoösis II.*, that Herodotus has erred so much in assigning the construction of the Labyrinth to so late a period as the Dodecarchy; while Diodorus, as we have remarked, places it in the earlier time. Whatever was the use for which it was designed by the king who built it, of which Herodotus gives a different account, it appears to have served the purpose of his tomb, and that of other successive kings, and crocodiles.

It is unnecessary for our present purpose to pursue the details of Diodorus any further. The period to which we have come is one which we have formerly investigated², and we have completed the enumeration of the successive reigns of the fifty-two who are accounted descendants of *Menès*, down to the Persian Conquest, when the succession of the native princes was cut off. We have found and have reset a dislocation of the history, and we have arrived at some important facts regarding the period following the reign of *Sesoösis the Great*, which we shall have occasion to return to afterwards, for fuller illustration of the history. Above all, we have accomplished something towards removing the monstrous error of placing *Menès*, and all the succession of his fifty-two descendants with their whole four-

² See Appendix of “Isaiah’s Testimony for Jesus.”

teen hundred years, before the accession of the first of the said fifty-two, in their more detailed enumeration! The general heading and statement of the sum had thus been treated as a thing to be *added* to the particulars of which it is the sum! If Diodorus himself is not clear of this mistake, he has furnished the data for its correction; and his participation in the mistake is less important, because he is simply the reporter, not the author, of the Chronology. After all, it is to the statements of Manetho that we are brought as our authority; for his appears to have been the principal, if not the only, priestly book accessible to Greeks. And it is at least extremely improbable that, in referring to the books of the priests, Diodorus should have neglected the work written expressly on the subject by the high priest Manetho, for the information, and by the command of king Ptolemy Philadelphus. We therefore proceed to show that, from that source, there is the best illustration and proof of the view of the Chronology of Diodorus which has been presented above. The calculation of the time and comparison of the facts of the history we may defer till we have before us a clear and comprehensive statement of Manetho, which furnishes their best exponent.

Meanwhile it may be obvious to the reader that the view which has been presented restores the Chronology furnished by Diodorus to something coherent and consecutive within itself. The period of fourteen hundred years is to be taken with the addition of thirty-five years, for those portions of the four Ethiopian reigns which were not included in the reigns of some contemporary native princes in the succession. To that sum the years of the Persian dynasty are to be added, and then the

years of the Macedonian kings and their successors, down to the time of Diodorus, 276 years. But on the misconstruction which has hitherto been followed by all the writers, there is placed an enormous hiatus of generations after generations, carefully detailed, *without the mention of any time at all*, except in one or two instances, and this in the midst between periods carefully numbered. By the view which we have taken, the sums of years stated by Diodorus give the following general result:—

52 generations of native kings successors of Menês, time given by Diodorus, <i>above</i>	1400 years.
Four Ethiopians	35 ,,
Persian Dynasty	135 ,,
Macedonian kings and their successors down to the time when Diodorus was writing in Egypt.	276 ,,
Add for that date B.C.	57 ,,
	<hr/>
Sum <i>above</i>	1903 ,,
To these, as will afterwards appear, we must add, according to Manetho, for the measure of fifteen more generations separately counted in his chronology (a period of which we have found also some indistinct traces in Diodorus).	443 ,,
Allow for the reign of Menês himself, according to Eusebius	62 ,,
	<hr/>
Thus we arrive at a date a little earlier than B.C. This is so far from being too early, that it is not early enough. Plainly there is too reduced an estimate for the four Ethiopians by at least twenty years; which, being added, we have	2408 ,,
	<hr/>
B.C.	2428 ,,

But even the last number is lower than that deducible from the Septuagint for Nimrod; and, by comparison with other data from Manetho, we shall find reason to put it seventy-three years higher. See below, Chap. X.

Compare also collaterally the date assigned by Simplicius to the early Babylonian astronomical observations, which were sent by Callisthenes to Aristotle. These, he tells us in his commentary on Aristotle's work "De Cœlo," Porphyry stated to extend over a period of 1903 years, down to the time of Alexander the Great³. And these numbers, compared with the date of Alexander, would give $1903 + 330 = \text{B.C. } 2233$, for the date at which those astronomical observations commenced. Here we have a scientific statement, on a scientific point, which none but the most incompetent would for a moment put in comparison with the vague and varying statements of mythical romance; and according to this statement the earliest of the astronomical observations was 196 years after the Septuagint date of the confusion of tongues at Babel.

³ See the passage quoted in Clinton's "Fasti Hellenici," vol. iii., p. 505.

CHAPTER IV.

THE GENERAL SCHEME OF MANETHO'S CHRONOLOGY RESTORED, FROM HIS OWN STATEMENT.

AN important passage of Manetho has been preserved to us, containing a distinct view of the general scheme of his Chronology, professedly extracted in his own words ; by the aid of which, in conjunction with the other evidence, it may be demonstrated that the numbering of the dynasties ascribed to Manetho, as given by the authors or transmitters of the dynastic lists which pass erroneously under the names of Eusebius and Africanus, in which they differ much from one another, is in the case of both founded on a grand mistake, and that the chronology which has been based on the summing of these dynastic lists contains an enormous error, of which Manetho is guiltless.

The passage which I refer to has been badly treated, and feebly as well as groundlessly impugned. It is to be found on page 6 of the Greek *Sozomena* of the first book of Eusebius's *Chronica*, in Scaliger's *Thesaurus Temporum* ; whose copy of it, though not perfect, affords a much better key than the more corrupted form in which it is given in our editions of the Chronography of Syncellus ; for into the latter some details of the duration of the reigns of

particular gods have been introduced, possibly garbled from the same volume of Manetho, but certainly not belonging to this passage, which presented only the general scheme. The effect of that interpolation, made evidently by persons who did not understand the structure of the general scheme, has been very greatly to obscure it. But the extract originally was not the writing of one who took the chronology of Manetho at second hand, but who had before him Manetho's work itself; from which he quotes the words of his dedication to Ptolemy Philadelphus, and then a passage containing the general scheme of his Chronology; both being taken from the book of *Sothis*¹, as the first volume of his

¹ It has been groundlessly objected to this citation, that we have not elsewhere this title of a book of Manetho. It cannot surely be concluded that all his works, and all their books or subdivisions, were mentioned in each place, or even in all places together, in which he is referred to. Josephus mentions that Manetho wrote in Greek all the history of the Egyptians, and he calls this work his *Ægyptiaca*. It was in three volumes, the first of which treated of "the kingdom of the gods and semi-divine kings," as we are told by the author of the Barbarous-Latin Extracts. This, we may at least understand, formed the principal and leading part of the volume; but the human kings down to Ammenemès, the ancestor of the so-called twelfth dynasty, were also contained in it, as we learn from the lists of dynasties ascribed to Africanus and Eusebius. The second volume carried the history down from Ammenemès to the close of the nineteenth dynasty, if we may trust the same lists thus far. Where is the improbability that each volume, or book, of the *Ægyptiaca* had some distinctive title; and that the general scheme of the Chronology being based on the Sothic Cycle, the first book, or volume, which contained it was thus called the book of *Sothis*? We know from the *Excerpta Barbara* that the subject of the first volume was "the kingdom of the gods." But, again, Josephus mentions that Manetho wrote particularly respecting the *theology* of the Egyptians, both in the *Sacred book*

Ægyptiaca appears to be there called ; “ in which,” says Eusebius, or the relator, “ *he writes as follows to the great king Ptolemy Philadelphus Sebastos* ².”

“ MANETHO, high priest, and scribe of the sacred shrines in Egypt, by descent a Sebennytian, of the city of Heliopolis, to my Lord Ptolemy, greeting.

“ It behoves me, O greatest King, to esteem of

which he composed and in his *other writings*; and Porphyry mentions one, *περὶ ἀρχαῖσμοῦ καὶ εὐσεβείας*, *Euseb. Præp. Evang.* iv. 16. Now, as Manetho measured the reigns of the gods by the Sothic Cycle, and connected them with the dynasties of men by which they were succeeded, where is the reasonable objection to the title ? There are “ *other works* ” also referred to without title. The objection is to the last degree frivolous and contemptible.

² These may be taken as the words of Eusebius, or of the relator whoever he was, speaking of Manetho as *γράφων οὐτως βασιλεῖ μεγάλῳ Πτολεμαίῳ Φιλαδέλφῳ σεβαστῷ*. An untenable objection has been taken to the genuineness of this Epistle, grounded on this word *Sebastos*, in consequence of its having been adopted by the Roman Emperors, as a title of majesty in the Greek language, corresponding to *Augustus* in the Latin ; as if that were a proof that this Epistle must belong to the period subsequent to the Roman conquest of Egypt. To this it may be replied, 1st. That *SEBASTOS* was not so much a Greek *rendering* of the title *AUGUSTUS*, as a *substitute* for it, derived from the religious veneration and divine honours assumed by the Macedonian kings and their Oriental and Egyptian predecessors in the sovereignty. Compare *σέβασμα*. The Roman Emperors did not export that idea of monarch-worship into the East, but adopted it thence. The criticism is therefore inconclusive in its broadest principle. 2ndly. If it were true that the word marked the Roman period, yet any one may see that the word is not any part of the letter, but is used by the later writer who quotes it, or at most only occurs in a title written over it. For in their epistles the ancients placed the name of the writer first. What matter then if this title were written over the quotation by a later hand ? The Epistle itself simply designates the king “ my Lord Ptolemy,” and “ the greatest king.” Scaliger, in his notes, p. 409, suggests that this word is by a later hand.

the highest importance the matters which you wish me to investigate; and in reply to your inquiry as to the things which are about to happen in the world, there shall be disclosed to you the sacred books which I have acquainted myself with, written by my great forefather Hermes the thrice greatest.”

THE KINGDOM OF THE GODS, ACCORDING TO THE OLD RECKONING OF TIME⁴.

(Extracted from the books of Manetho).

“There is no measured time of Vulcan, on account of his shining night and day. Next reigned Kronos, and all the other gods twelve, a period of three thousand, and [three] myriad⁵, and

⁴ An objection has been founded on the word *τρισμεγίστου*, which we shall have occasion to notice afterwards.

⁵ The kingdom of the gods and of the demi-gods, was the subject of the first volume of the “Ægyptiaca.” It must be remembered, as before pointed out (p. 14), that *κατὰ τὸ παλαιὸν χρονικὸν* is not the Greek for “according to the old Chronicle, or Chronography,” which would be expressed by the plural, *τὰ χρονικά*. Syncellus’s speaking of it as *παλαιόν τι χρονογραφεῖον*, is therefore a grammatical mistake on his part, by which he has misled all the later critics.

It is to be observed that the numeral mark  employed for a *myriad* in this passage, as given by Scaliger, is the same with one form of the *San*, or *Sanpi*, which is used to denote 900, and found repeatedly in that sense in Scaliger’s Greek text of Eusebius’s *Chronica, Thesaur. Temp. ed. Amstelodami*, 1658. The form is given also in Scaliger’s *Animadversiones* in the same collection, p. 110, in his *Digressio de literarum Ionicarum origine*. But there cannot be a doubt that it here denotes *myriads*, as is demonstrable from the passage itself; while the ambiguity arising from this double use of it accounts for several of the corruptions of the passage. The same numeral mark has also been mistaken in one instance for *A*, and read 1000, but that case is foreign to the present.

eight hundred and four years⁶. Next the semi-divine kings, fifty in number, eight hundred and seventeen years⁷: and after them fifteen generations

* The number as it now stands is written $\Sigma \pi \delta$, but erroneously, as will be found on casting the numbers together. The notation of the *number* of the myriads is by mistake omitted, but is afterwards given in the passage itself $\pi \gamma$. The π has arisen from mistaking ω , as will afterwards appear. The period is 33,804 years: the notation should be read $\gamma, \pi \gamma, \omega \delta$; or, γ , *My, ωδ*.

⁸ The number is erroneously written $\epsilon\tau\eta \sigma\zeta$ instead of $\omega\zeta$ (217 instead of 817), by mistake of ω for Σ ; that form of omega being often written with the square characters. The correction admits of demonstration; because the fifteen generations next mentioned are said to complete by their 443 years a canicular cycle. Now this cycle consists of 1461 years; from which, subtracting 443, we find that the number of years of the cycle which had previously run are 1018; of which the 817 years are still short by 201 years. But it is to be considered that the 443 years must complete, not only a cycle, but a definite number of cycles from the commencement, so as not to leave a broken cycle previous to the one then said to be completed. Now the number of years assigned to the gods is 33,804; equal to 23 complete cycles and 201 years over. For $1461 \times 23 = 33,603$; but the number of years assigned to the gods in this passage, 33,804, is 201 in excess of this; and $201 + 817 + 443 = 1461$. Thus the 443 years precisely complete the twenty-fourth cycle; and it will be found on trial that this test affords a decisive proof of the correctness of our reading of the period assigned to the gods. If the restoration which I have proposed were not the true one, it would not have yielded this exact result.

It is worthy to be remarked that in a corrupted representation of this ancient scheme of chronology given in Syncellus, though the number of years assigned to the gods is erroneously given 34,201, there is there, nevertheless, a singular preservation of the true *excess over the round number*, namely, 201, which is the exact surplus as shown above; but it ought to be over the round number of cycles, not of thousands. Thus, even that corrupt reading bears witness in favour of my restoration of the number.

of a canicular cycle were added for its completion, in four hundred and forty-three years. Then the sixteenth⁸ [read seventeenth] dynasty of Tanites, eight generations, reigned 190 years; in addition to whom the seventeenth [read eighteenth] dynasty, of Memphites, fourteen generations, 348 years; then the nineteenth dynasty, of Diospolites, five generations, 194 years; then the twentieth dynasty of Diospolites, eight generations, 228 years; then the twenty-first dynasty, of Tanites, sixteen generations, 121 years; then the twenty-second dynasty of Tanites, three⁹ generations, forty-eight years; then the twenty-third dynasty, of Diospolites, two generations, nineteen years; then the twenty-fourth dynasty, of Saïtes,

⁸ Not the *sixteenth*, but the *seventeenth*, dynasty in Egypt; for Eusebius, or an ancient writer with reason understood by Scaliger to be he, and relied on as sufficient authority by Syncellus, expressly informs us that the sixteenth dynasty was included by Manetho in the past canicular cycle. Yet the sixteenth dynasty still survived at Thebes; and afterwards conquered the seventeenth or Shepherd dynasty, and expelled it. Hence a mysterious confusion of numbers. For the Shepherd dynasty, as it *preceded* and was conquered by the returning *sixteenth*, came to be put by some very absurdly as the *fifteenth*! But again the sixteenth at Thebes, following the *seventeenth* in Egypt, became there properly transformed into the *eighteenth*. Hence it is, perhaps, that the blundering lists ascribed falsely to Africanus, have made the Shepherd dynasty into the *fifteenth*, *sixteenth*, and *seventeenth*! It is astonishing that Scaliger should have made the mistake of approving this, by accepting a mis-statement of Syncellus, who brings a gratuitous and foolish charge against Eusebius on the subject, for not concurring in the absurdity, of which neither he nor his translator Jerome appears ever to have heard. Scalig. "Notæ in Græca Eusebii," p. 412, ad pag. 16. See above, note to Chap. III. p. 83.

⁹ The reading is 300, but manifestly corrupt; T by mistake for F; the headline having been accidentally drawn too far across.

three¹ generations, forty-four years; after whom the twenty-sixth dynasty, of Memphites, seven generations, 177 years; and after them the twenty-seventh dynasty, of Persians, five generations, 124 years; the twenty-eighth dynasty ; then the twenty-ninth dynasty, of Tanites, of —— generations, thirty-nine years; and last of all the thirtieth dynasty of one Tanite, eighteen years:— the total of the years of the thirty dynasties together, three myriads and six thousand five hundred and twenty-five² (36,525). These analyzed or divided by 1461 years, show twenty-five times that revolution (*ἀποκατάστασις*) of the zodiacal signs, which is mythically treated³ among the Egyptians and the Greeks.” “That is,”—subjoins not Manetho but Africanus, or the writer who furnished the extract, in the way of annotation and explanation of the passage quoted,—“the revolution [of the months] from the same sign to the same sign again, which is *one*⁴ second of the first degree of the equinoctial sign of the zodiac, called by them Aries;—as is also said in the Genica of Hermes, and in the Cyranic books.”

¹ The reading is twenty-three. I have omitted the twenty as probably a mistake of some transcriber.

² Written ἔτη Αἰγ., καὶ σφκε; that is, undeniably ἔτη Μῆ καὶ σφκε.

³ Μυθολογούμενην; that is, employed mythically as a shadow of another and greater *ἀποκατάστασις*.

⁴ “Ἐν λεπτὸν τῆς πρώτης μοίρας: the use of the cardinal for the ordinal number (“one” for “the first”) is a Hebraistic idiom. Julius Africanus was a native of Palestine, and might therefore have been accustomed to such idioms. The subsequent confirmation of the statement from the Genica of Hermes and the Cyranic books may be from the pen of *Eusebius*; but not that Hebraistic expression, unless he took it from those books, or from Africanus.

The fact that the writer who has furnished us with this important extract from Manetho, has in his explanatory annotation quoted the Genica of Hermes⁵, and the Cyranic books⁶, as containing authority for his minute definition of this mythic ἀποκατάστασις, or revolution of the zodiacal signs in the Canicular Cycle, surely affords no argument against the genuineness of the extract from Manetho, except to the most hasty thought and superficial criticism. For even assuming it to be proved, as Fabricius suspected, that these particular Hermetic books were not the genuine works of Thoth, but written about the beginning of the second century, still why should not Africanus or Eusebius, in supplying that explanatory annotation beginning with τοῦτ' ἔστι, refer to these books, if he thought them genuine, in illustration of his comment? Moreover, it is not proved that the books there quoted were the spurious books alleged. Most certainly they were not those spurious Hermetic books on astrology as applied to medicine, which are published in Ideler's *Medici Græci Minores* (vol. i. pp. 387, and 430), which have no manner of relation to the subject, nor contain the quotation. Neither is it proved that there had been no genuine works of Thoth known by these titles; even though, after they were lost, there might have been spurious ones

⁵ "Puto in illo libro origines contentas fuisse, ut prima pars primi libri Mosis dicitur βίβλος γενική." Scalig. "Notæ in Græca Eusebii," p. 409.

⁶ Εν τοῖς Κυρανίσι βίβλοις. "Omnino est verbum Arabicum, quo nomine vocata impuri Mohammedis lex Κυρὰν, Ἀλκυράν. Nam multa Arabica in vetustis monimentis Aegyptiorum observavimus," &c., Scalig. ibid. According to this, the expression "the Cyranic books" would be not far from our use of the phrase "Canonical books."

substituted under the same names. Nor is a reference to Hermes as an authority on these subjects, a proof that he who makes the reference lived in the second or third century; for Strabo, in the reign of Augustus, speaking of the manner of adjusting the Egyptian year to the solar by a certain cycle,—the nature of which he rather obscurely states, like one who himself understood the intercalation of the Julian year better than the nature of the Sothic cycle,—adds, ἀνατιθέασι δὲ τῷ Ἐρμῷ πᾶσαν τὴν τοιαύτην μάλιστα σοφίαν, “They ascribe to Hermes all science, especially of that description.” Indeed, the fact was notorious. Diodorus tells us the same. Cicero mentions *two* Egyptian Mercuries; one whom the Egyptians thought it not lawful to name, the other the inventor of laws and letters, whom they called Thoth, as they called also the first month of their year⁷. Plato, in his “Philebus,” mentions him as a god or divine man, by the name of Theuth, and describes in an interesting manner the analysis of the articulations of the voice in speech, necessary to the invention of writing; by which he plainly attributes to his invention an alphabetic character, expressive of *sounds*, not *things*. And again, in his “Phaedrus,” he ascribes to Theuth, one of the old gods of the Egyptians, the invention of numeration, calculation, geometry, and astronomy, the game of dice, and the art of writing; and he assigns him to the period of a certain Theban king who reigned over all Egypt, whom he calls Θαμοῦ (Thamou), probably another pronunciation of the name Thummōsis, Thouthmōsis, Tethmōsis, or Thmōsis,—that is,

⁷ Strabo, lib. xvii. c. 1, p. 693, l. 30, ed. Mueller, 8vo. Par. 1853.

⁸ “De Nat. Deor.” iii. 22.

either the Thoth-Amosis who expelled the Shepherds and reigned the first of the eighteenth dynasty, or else very likely the sixth or seventh of that dynasty, the nearer predecessor of Sesostris,—to whom Hermes communicated his inventions⁹.

But if our critics thought a reference to the Genica of Hermes and the Cyranic books, fatal to the genuineness of this Manethonian scheme, in support of which they were quoted, why did they not see the same objection when Hermetic books on anatomy and medicine were quoted and declared to be still extant, in the alleged Manethonian dynasties transmitted under the name of Africanus? Have they diminished the objection by shifting the author a few thousand years further back into remote and fabulous antiquity, and making these works, which are there affirmed to be still extant, 5354 years old at the time of Alexander the Great, and of course older still in the day of Manetho? The words are plain at the beginning of the first dynasty, *οὐ φέρονται βιβλοὶ ἀνατομικαὶ, ἵστρος γὰρ ἦν*, “Of whom there are extant anatomical books, for he was a physician.” I confess my judgment does not accord with that of the critics, as to the comparative probability and improbability of the two cases.

Before proceeding to Manetho's historical and chronological adaptation of this scheme of twenty-five Canicular Cycles, it is proper to consider first, the construction of the scheme itself, which is older than the application. Now in this construction, the multiplier 25 is the Egyptian Lunar Cycle, applicable to their year, which was uniformly of 365 days without intercalation. That Lunar Cycle consisted

⁹ Plat. Opp. 8vo. Lond. 1826, vol. i. p. 185, and vol. v. p. 445.

of 309 lunations, corresponding to twenty-five of their years; and it was more exact than is the Cycle of nineteen years accommodated to the Julian year. For twenty-five Egyptian years contain 9125 days; and 309 lunations (taking a lunation at 29 days 12 h. 44 min. 2 sec. 53 th., which is the measure given by Mayer¹), amount to 9124 days, 22 hours, 50 minutes, and 51 seconds; being less than the days of twenty-five Egyptian years by only 1 hour, 9 min. 9 sec.; on the other hand, nineteen Julian years contain 6939 days, 18 hours; which exceed 235 lunations (amounting to 6939 days, 16 hours, 31 minutes, 17 seconds) by 1 hour, 28 minutes, and 43 seconds. The object of thus multiplying their Canicular by their Lunar Cycle was scientific, and will be sufficiently obvious to the reader, on considering that, while the Egyptian Lunar Cycle, consisting of twenty-five of their years, was thus more exact than ours, their year itself, for want of the quadrennial intercalation, was continually in defect of the solar year, and kept receding further and further from the commencing point of the seasons, until the winter months passed into the summer season, and continued their revolution round ultimately to their former position. It

¹ See table given in Hales's Chronology, 2nd edit. 8vo, vol. i. p. 55. See also Dr. Hales's clear exposition of the Egyptian Lunar Cycle, *ibid.* p. 39. Ferguson in his tables gives the lunation 29 days, 12 hours, 44 min., 3 seconds, 2 thirds, 58 fourths. It is well known that the period of the lunar revolution was in ancient times slightly longer. Scaliger ("Can. Isag." lib. iii., p. 176) informs us that the Jews in his day estimated the lunation to be 29 days, 12 hours, and 793 scruples (their scruple being the 1080th part of an hour); equivalent to 44 min., 3 seconds, 20 thirds. This measure is said to have come down from Samuel Jarchinai, A.D. 250. Their scruple follows the subdivision of the hour by sixties, being the 18th 60th part ($18 \times 60 = 1080$).

required, according to their theory, the Cycle of 1461 of their years (equal to 1460 Julian years) to bring the months thus round to the same relation to the star Sothis in the sidereal heavens, and to the four seasons. Now, their Lunar Cycle of twenty-five years adjusted the restoration of the positions of the sun, moon, and earth relatively to the days of their moving year²; but to adjust it also to the seasons and the stars, required the multiplication of it by their Sothic Cycle. This was a perfectly correct and scientific principle; and its object was correctly expressed as an *ἀποκατάστασις*, or restoration of the heavenly bodies to their first position.

So immense a theoretical period was a severe test of accuracy. Their Lunar Cycle, consisting of 309 lunations, being multiplied by 1461, would give a total of 451,449 lunations, which by Ferguson's tables are equivalent to 13,331,555 days, 17 hours, 1 minute. But in twenty-five Canicular Cycles there are 13,331,625 days. The lunations so computed are thus deficient, in comparison with that vast period, by 69 days, 6 hours, 59 minutes. In their practical application of their Luni-Canicular Cycle, it would therefore be necessary to consider the moon as becoming one day earlier every 532 of their years; and with this allowance the computation would be in a high degree exact. For that allowance of one day in every 532 years would in the whole vast period

² This is the proper meaning of the expression employed by Dodwell and others, in calling the Egyptian year the *annus vagus*, as distinguished from the *annus fixus*. That year had nothing "vague" about it in the English sense of the word, but it was a *moving year*, in which the months were not fixed to the cardinal points of the seasons, but slowly and regularly revolved. It is absurd to call it the *vague year*.

amount to 68 days, 15 hours, 44 minutes, $55\frac{1}{2}$ seconds, thus corresponding to the whole deficiency except 15 hours, 14 minutes. And, as it is known that the lunation was anciently longer than now by a very minute quantity ³, there being a proved secular acceleration of the moon's motion, it may be proper to remark that those 15 hours and 14 minutes, if divided among the whole number of the lunations of that greatest period, would add only between the eighth and ninth of a second to the length of each lunation as given above. Whether the Egyptian men of science actually applied the exact method now suggested for the practical correction of their great Cycle, we are unable to say positively; but we are told historically of their having had a period of from 500⁴ to 540⁵ years, and here is a purpose which it would fit. The latter measure, however, might also be considered as in round numbers the space of thirty Chaldean Saroses. If they had, and so applied, a period of 532 years, their computation was nearly perfect. If not, the practical error of their great Cycle was one day in 532 Egyptian years; which is much less than the error of ours, for that would

³ The Jews, from the dependence of their feasts upon the moon, were particularly observant of lunar time; and Scaliger, as cited above, p. 108, *note*, informs us that in his day they estimated the lunation at 29 days, 12 hours, 44 minutes, 3 seconds, and 20 thirds. This measurement they professed to have received from a Rabbi who flourished two centuries and a half after Christ. But whether it had come down to them from that antiquity or not, the period of Manetho himself was between five and six centuries earlier than that, and the scheme was constructed on still earlier observations; the measure would therefore be greater. Even this exceeds Ferguson's a quarter of a second.

⁴ Tacit. "Annal." vi. 28.

⁵ Plin. x. 2, on the authority of Manilius. Some edd. DLX, or DIX.

amount to one day in 322 years. Upon this question it is worthy to be noted that our blessed Lord and His disciples did observe the Passover a day earlier than the Jews (compare Matt. xxvi. 17, 62, Mark xiv. 12, 14, John xviii. 28, xix. 31); in other words, they held the day of new moon and of full moon to be a day earlier than it was reckoned in the calendar of the Jews; and that difference of a day had arisen in the interval since the return from the Babylonish Captivity. Now, as I have elsewhere shown⁶, an interval of 532 years had elapsed from the first passover on the return from the Captivity to the birth of Christ; and that interval was precisely ascertained by the heliacal rising of the star of the Magi. Thus the existence and use of this period, known to Daniel, and from his day to the Magi, solve the theological difficulty of the day of the Passover as observed by our Lord and by the Jews. Hence also the probable origin of the Paschal Cycle. We may add that if the correction of the Luni-Canicular Cycle by the method indicated was not due to Thoth, it is probably to be ascribed to Daniel, and is not later than his day. We shall have something further to offer in regard to the star of the nativity of Christ in the second section of our tenth chapter. But to return.

The introduction of the Julian year destroyed the use of the Egyptian Luni-Canicular Cycle, and rendered it no longer even intelligible to those who were accustomed only to the new computation. The Lunar Cycle of twenty-five years had necessarily disappeared with the Egyptian moving year and Sothic Cycle. Why the number of twenty-five years should be so much regarded by the Egyptians became there-

⁶ See the Appendix to my "Isaiah's Testimony for Jesus," pp. 596—601.

fore a mystery even to heathen philosophers; and the philosophic Plutarch, who died at an advanced age about A.D. 140, informs us that it was because the Egyptians mystically respected the square of five, as their bull Apis lived just so many years, in conformity with the number of the letters of the Egyptian alphabet⁷. Jablonski, who cites Plutarch's explanation, cannot himself see how 25 years should have been their Lunar Cycle, corresponding to our cycle of nineteen. Nay, he consulted the professor of mathematics, his colleague in the University of Frankfort, who could not see it either⁸. In all which

⁷ "De Iside," p. 374, ποιεῖ δὲ τετράγωνον ἡ πεντάς ἀφ' ἔαντῆς ὅσον τῶν γραμμάτων παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις τὸ πλήθος ἐστι, καὶ ὅσον ἐνιαυτῶν ἔξη χρόνον ὁ Ἀπις. ["Ita ex editione Basiliensi hic legendum." *Jablonski, Panth. Aegypt.*, lib. iv. cap. 2, § 10, p. 196.]

⁸ As it is of some importance to the cogency of proof that it should be known how completely the Julian year destroyed the power of even perceiving the basis of this Manethonian scheme, the reader may find the following passage acceptable. Jablonski cites and discusses the following statement from Dodwell (Append. ad Dissert. Cyprian., § 14), "Nempe credebant Aegyptii lunæ cum sole in eundem locum ἀποκατάστασι, xxv annorum circuitu contingere, annorum scilicet vagorum Aegyptiacorum, ut proinde anni magni ἀποκατάστασι rediret post cyclum annorum vagorum MCCCCCLXI quinquies repetitum atque vigesies. Si hoc, quod vir doctissimus observat, admitti posset, tum nobis ratio mystica, in libris sacerdotalibus prodata, ob quam vitæ Apidis anni statuti essent xxv, clare pateret. Nempe post annos xxv Sol et Luna in eundem cœli locum reverterentur, et novum cyclum totidem annorum redauspicarentur. Et Apidem vero, tum Soli, tum Lunæ, ratione singulari sacratum fuisse, ex § 3 satis constat. Marshamus etiam longius progreditur, asserando, annos xxv Aegyptiorum vagos æquales (?) esse Julianis xix, qui cyclum illum notissimum Lunarem absolvunt. B. Vignolius, cuius raram in disciplinis mathematicis et astronomicis peritiam eruditio omnes agnoscent, postquam Marshami eam in rem verba attulisset, hanc quidem ejus observationem non improbat, verum censet tamen eam non recte ab ipso applicari ad aliud quid

it is sufficiently manifest, that the structure of this Manethonian scheme is such that it neither *was* nor *could have been* invented after the introduction of the Julian year—nay, that it ceased even to be understood; and that they who have pretended that it was fabricated by some persons later than the Christian era—later, forsooth, than Eusebius—did so neither understanding it themselves nor attributing it to persons who have shown any sign of understanding it. That the *ἀποκατάστασις*, or restoration of the heavenly bodies, should have been made a type, and treated by some astrologically, by others mystically, as the material shell and groundwork of a greater spiritual revolution and *ἀποκατάστασις*, is nothing at variance with the scientific basis of it which has been shown. The Manethonian extract does not leave us in doubt upon this point, but informs us that the Sothic Cycle *was* thus mystically treated both by the Egyptians

demonstrandum. Cum tamen nulla ratione perspicere possem, quomodo anni *Ægyptiorum* vagi *xxv*, æquales esse possent *xix* Julianis, adeoque plenum cyclum lunarem accurate constituere et absolvere, consului super ea re collegam conjunctissimum, multisque nominibus mihi impense colendum, D. Io. Fridericum Polac, Jur. et Mathematum in nostra Academia professorem celebrissimum, atque hoc ab eo responsum tuli, rem ipsam veritati consentaneum prorsus non esse, cum annus *Ægyptiacus* vagus, a Juliano fixo, quatuor quibusque annis, nonnisi uno die recedat, ac differat, fieri vero potuisse, ut Sacerdotes *Ægyptii*, ob RATIONEM NOBIS IGNOTAM, censuerint, post absolutum annorum *xxv* curriculum, contingere aliquam novam Solis et Lunæ *ἀποκατάστασιν*, et Dodwellum nihil nisi hoc adstruxisse. Et vero mihi jam nunc sufficit. Neque profecto negari potest, aut negatum quaquam fuit, numerum annorum *xxv*, *Ægyptiis* tanquam mysticum, et præceptis religionis suæ imprimis accommodatum, in pretio singulare sacrumque fuisse.”—Jablonski, *Panth. Ægypt.*, iv. 2, § 1.

and the Greeks; and we have learned that the length of their Lunar Cycle, which is the multiplier employed, was placed by them in mysterious connexion with the worship and the measured life of the bull Apis, in which was bodied forth their doctrine of the return of the soul of Osiris⁹. All their astronomers astrologized; all their priests held their peculiar doctrine of the return of souls by the metempsychosis, and of the restitution and regeneration of the world: But whatever mystic doctrine they thus grafted upon it, that cannot take from the strictly correct and scientific basis of the construction, as a compound cycle, similar in principle to the Paschal Cycle and Julian Period. It may be said, What could be the scientific use of a cycle so prodigiously extending beyond all human limits of history and experience? But, just as a knowledge of the properties of the particular curve which forms the orbit of some moving body that may plunge into illimitable space for millions of millions of miles, is necessary to the calculation even of the small portion of its path which may fall within our range of observation, so this vast cycle of time was applicable to the determination of questions affecting the several limited parts of the grand revolution.

We may here, in passing, notice the fact that the excess of the Julian year over the Egyptian year of 365 days, being a quarter of a day every year, amounts to 25 days in every century, and therefore to 25 years in a GREAT CENTURY, consisting of a hundred GREAT YEARS, *of which every day is taken for a year*; and this GREAT CENTURY is precisely equal to

⁹ Diodor. i. 85.

25 Canicular Cycles. We may state it arithmetically thus :—

$$365\frac{1}{4} \text{ years} \times 100 = 36,525 \text{ years.}$$

$$1461 \text{ years} \times 25 = 36,525 \text{ years.}$$

But this view of the old Egyptian Luni-Canicular scheme of computation results from comparison of it with the Julian year, and did not form any part of the object contemplated in its construction, nor was equally likely to occur to any one before the introduction of the Julian computation. After that, however, this quality of it was probably soon observed. Certainly, as we know, it was observed by Anianus and Panodorus, Egyptian monks in the close of the fifth century, and seems to have pretty nearly constituted all that they understood of it; which little they absurdly inverted and misapplied, as we shall show by and by.

So much, then, we have ascertained respecting the astronomical principle of this Manethonian construction; we come next to his chronological application of it. Now, as Manetho states expressly that a Canicular Cycle was completed by the 443 years, we should expect that the remaining numbers which follow the 443, at least up to some definite point, would yield a sum which is also a complete cycle, because a sum total is given of twenty-five cycles. But we find on summing the periods allotted to the gods and semi-divine kings, together with the 443 years added for completion, that they yield exactly twenty-four cycles.

$$33,804 + 817 + 443 = 35,064.$$

$$1461 \times 24 = 35,064.$$

Therefore the sum of certain remaining numbers must make up the twenty-fifth cycle; or, in other words, they

amount to 1461 Egyptian years, beginning from the close of the 443 above mentioned; and, if they do not include the whole dynasties of Manetho from that point onward, and carry to the end of them, it is at least manifest that there was not a twenty-sixth cycle to be made out of them, but whatever is in excess of the twenty-five cycles can only be a portion of one current and incomplete.

The numeration of the dynasties is as follows:—

THIRTEEN DYNASTIES OF GODS,—Saturn and the twelve	33,804 years.
FOURTEENTH, one dynasty of semi-divine kings [a succession consisting of <i>five</i> , not <i> fifty</i> , as will eventually appear]	817 , ,
FIFTEENTH and SIXTEENTH ¹ ,—together, FIFTEEN GENERATIONS OF KINGS, counted in two stages, or as two dynasties, completing the twenty-fourth Canicular Cycle	443 ,
Twenty-four cycles complete, $1461 \times 24 =$	<u>35,064 years.</u>

¹ That the sixteenth dynasty, as regards Egypt generally, was included by Manetho in the period of 443 years of the fifteen generations which went to complete the past Canicular Cycle, is distinctly stated by Eusebius in a passage which will be more particularly noticed afterwards. It appears however that the same sixteenth dynasty continued at Thebes contemporaneously with the seventeenth in Lower Egypt during the period of the Shepherds; and it may be to that portion of it that the duration of 160 or 190 years, given by Eusebius from Manetho (*Chron. Canon, sub init.*—above, p. 83 note), ought to be applied. This may have contributed to the error here occurring in the numeration of the dynasties in this general scheme. Syncellus in his corrupted copy, or else some transcriber of Syncellus, has interpolated another dynasty as seventeenth, with the number of years 103; but this is probably a duplicate of his sixteenth, modified in duration, in a manner of which we shall afterwards notice a probable explanation.

SEVENTEENTH, or Shepherd dynasty in Egypt; continuation of the sixteenth dynasty at Thebes contemporaneously . . .	8 Tanites	190 years.
EIGHTEENTH dynasty (erroneously numbered the seventeenth)	14 Memphites	348 "
N.B. The number of the years is the same with that of the eighteenth dynasty in the list under the name of Eusebius.		
NINETEENTH dynasty, Diospolitans	194 "	
TWENTIETH ditto, Diospolitans	228 "	
TWENTY-FIRST ditto, Tanites	121 "	
TWENTY-SECOND ditto, Tanites	48 "	
TWENTY-THIRD ditto, Diospolitans	19 "	
TWENTY-FOURTH ditto, Saïtes	44 "	
[TWENTY-FIFTH ² ditto, <i>omitted</i> , Ethiopian, three kings	30] "	
TWENTY-SIXTH ditto, Memphites	177 "	
TWENTY-SEVENTH ditto, Persians	[135] ³ "	
TWENTY-EIGHTH ditto (<i>years omitted</i>), [1 Ethiopian or Libyan	6] ⁴ "	

² Syncellus, in his more corrupt copy, gives the dynasty, but repeats the number of years of the previous dynasty, 44. The number of the years is here restored from the list ascribed to Africanus, which gives the respective years of the three kings, 8, 14, and 8, = 30; and from Diodorus, who gives to the *four* Ethiopians less than 36 years, in which he thus includes the 28th dynasty.

³ The number of years is given 124, but incorrectly and not as originally written, having evidently been taken, including a palpable error of four years, from the list ascribed to Africanus, and without adverting to the later portion of the Persian dynasty which is there given afterwards separately. The number is here corrected from Diodorus.

⁴ The number of years of the Twenty-eighth dynasty is here supplied from the lists ascribed to Eusebius and Africanus. The name of Amyrtæus, a Saïte, is given by them to the one king of this dynasty. No king of that name is mentioned by Diodorus. I have shown in the Appendix of "Isaiah's Testimony for Jesus," p. 457, that the word Myrtæus or Amyrtæus probably means "The Expatriated," or "The Refugee;" so that the king had some other name. Herodotus mentions him, and

TWENTY-NINTH dynasty, Tanites	39 years.
THIRTIETH ditto, 1 Tanite	18 , ,
Total number of years from the beginning of the Seventeenth dynasty	<u>1597</u> years.
Let us now assume the last of these years to be incomplete, as we are entitled to do from what has been noted of the Twenty-eighth dynasty, and the measure of years completed becomes	1596 , ,
Deduct the years of the Persian dynasty, as foreign to the time occupied by the native succession	135 , ,
Sum of the years of the native dynasties to the close of the Thirtieth, equal to ONE CANI- CULAR CYCLE	<u>1461</u> years.

that his son Pausiris was permitted to succeed him in his government. That name also is not mentioned by Diodorus. I suspect that the person who is separately classed by Manetho in this dynasty was Inarus, whom Herodotus calls a Libyan, and king of Libya. I think so because Diodorus seems to sum the years of his reign with the Ethiopians of the Twenty-fifth dynasty, indicating him to have been in a similar relation to Egypt, and not a native. Inarus reigned, first, over two years from the revolt in the close of the reign of Darius Hystaspes, and again three years from the death of Xerxes (Herodotus iii. 1—7. Diodor. xi. 71—77). The years of the Ethiopians, as summed by Diodorus, are "under thirty-six;" not quite six years more than in this table. Therefore this reign may have been taken by him correctly as not six years complete. The relation of Lybia to Ethiopia, in the language of Diodorus, may be illustrated by the following instances :—

'Απὸ Μέμφεως ἄχρι Θηβῶν τῶν κατὰ Λιβύην.—Diodor. i. 45.

*'Επιμελητὰς δὲ τάξαι, τῶν μὲν πρὸς Φουίκην κεκλιμένων μερῶν καὶ
τῶν ἐπὶ θαλάττη τόπων, Βούσιριν, τῶν δὲ κατὰ τὴν Αἰθιοπίαν καὶ
Λιβύην, Ἀνταῖον.—Diodor. i. 17.*

And this use of language is justified by the manifest political relation of the two races of people indicated in 2 Chron. xiv. 9. 12, 13; xvi. 8.

This restoration of the numbers of the dynasties from the seventeenth to the thirtieth inclusive may of course be open to more or less of doubt; though no liberty has been taken beyond restoring the confessedly omitted numbers, by no means on conjecture, and correcting the obvious error which has crept into the number of years of the Twenty-seventh dynasty by the evidence of Diodorus; in which last, however, the number, whatever it be, as should be particularly observed, does not affect the sum of the *native* dynasties. But the result is sufficient to show beyond dispute what the nature of the computation was.

That result may be confirmed from a passage of the foreign Broken-Latin Chronologist in relation to Manetho, which is as follows:—"Usque ad decimam septimam potestatem, secundum scribitur, totum, ut docet, numerum habentem annos mille quingentos xx :" that is, "Manetho informs us that the sum of the years measuring as far back as the extent of the Seventeenth dynasty is one thousand five hundred and twenty." As this sum does not result from the detailed numbers furnished by the Barbarous-Latin writer in the same place, it affords from that circumstance only so much the more valuable confirmation of the place before us; as it thus appears to be substantially a detached statement of Manetho's own, and not a deduction of his blundering and incompetent readers, from the numbers which they have extracted. The number is reckoned back to the beginning of the Seventeenth dynasty, which (though there were fifteen generations allowed for before it) is the first of the mortal dynasties *expressly numbered* in the above extract. Manetho, as we have seen, there reckons the duration of the native

dynasties, from the close of the 443 years which complete the twenty-fourth Canicular Cycle, to the end of the Thirtieth dynasty, and the beginning of the Empire of Alexander the Great, as being exactly 1461 years, exclusive of the Persian dynasty. Add to these the years from the beginning of the Empire of Alexander in Egypt to the time of Manetho's writing, say, fifty-nine years, which will bring us to the close of the first twelve years of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and the sum is 1520.

As the dynasty to which this Chronologist here counts back is called by him the *seventeenth*, the evidence of this Latin passage may be taken as incidentally supporting our correction of the numbering of the two first dynasties which follow the 443 years, as the seventeenth and eighteenth respectively. And it is plain that a correction of some sort is there necessary; for, if the numeration of these two dynasties be not thus amended, there is the *omission* of a dynasty in the passage which has formed the groundwork of these remarks.

The measure of the twenty-fifth Canicular Cycle of Manetho, therefore, commencing at the Seventeenth dynasty, does not sum up the years of all the dynasties there numbered; for it obviously excludes the Persian, as we have seen—concurrently with which the native dynasty might thus be understood as prolonged in its unrelinquished rights, though not in power; so that the 135 years of the Persian dynasty in Egypt might doubtfully appear to be included in those of the preceding native dynasty. But again, there are the four Ethiopian kings, who, in the above Manethonian table, are allowed together thirty-six years; and if these were deducted on the same principle, the Canicular Cycle would not be

complete at Alexander's date. Manetho might veil this circumstance to suit the purpose of flattering the Greek dynasty; but the sum of the years from the commencement of the cycle would thus strictly be reduced to not more than 1425.

The statement of Diodorus here comes to our aid, with its more detailed information, derived probably from Manetho. Fifty-two descendants of Menês, he tells us, reigned *more than 1400 years*. Menês himself, however, as Eusebius states, reigned sixty years; and the dynastic lists ascribed to Africanus would prolong his reign to the sixty-second. Menês, therefore, and those fifty-two descendants, on this reckoning, reigned together 1461 years, equal to a Canicular Cycle. It is almost as if this duration of the reign of Menês might have been assigned by ancient chronologists just to round off the cycle. But plainly the reign of Menês came within the period *preceding* the cycle, either as included in the 443 years of the fifteen generations which were counted for the completion of a supposed preceding cycle; or else before even these. The succession of those fifty-two descendants, measured from the beginning of the cycle, being only somewhat more than 1400 years; would therefore terminate before the full cycle of 1461 years reached its close, at whatever time that might be; but being fictitiously represented as extended nearly thirty-six years more by the four Ethiopians who reigned at intervals in the course of that succession (but whose years did not add to the *native* generations), they would seem to come only within twenty-five years of its close. No doubt those twenty-five years, by which the numbers are in this view short of the cycle, might be unsatisfactorily supplied, if allowed for in the

vague statement of the time of the fifty-two generations, as given by Diodorus “*more than* fourteen hundred years.”

Manetho certainly appears to have eased the numbers a little by dexterous management, to make the cycle seem to terminate, and a new one to commence, with Alexander the Great, for courtly flattery of the Greek horoscope, and also for popular satisfaction in the thought that the previously current cycle of native Egyptian history had not been marred of its completion. If the years of the Persian dynasty are left out as not adding to the span of native generations, the four Ethiopians should be left out for the same reason; but they are counted. Moreover, for some purpose, the reigns of the four Ethiopians have been cut down from their full proportions. For Herodotus tells us that the reign of the Ethiopian Sabacus was fifty years; and the last of the four Ethiopians (so called), who is probably the same with Inarus the Libyan, reigned about six years. Assuming that Herodotus confounded three of the Ethiopian kings under their common title of Sabacus, or Sava of Cush, we still cannot make the full sum of the four less than fifty-six years, instead of *thirty-six*; and this will affect the proportion of time to be allowed to the native generations. If, even including thirty-six years of the four Ethiopian reigns, the years of the fifty-two native successions really wanted twenty-five years of completing the cycle—then, taking those four reigns at their *full* value of fifty-six years, and deducting them, would leave the cycle incomplete to the extent of eighty-one years ($56 + 25$); so that it would not terminate till b.c. 251, towards the close of the reign of Philadelphus, and eighty-one years after Alexander the

Great acquired the sovereignty of Egypt. This would place the commencement of the cycle about B.C. 1712, nearly in agreement with one computation of it, which we learn from Tacitus was actually made by some, who carried its termination down to the reign of the third Ptolemy⁵, whose accession was in the year B.C. 247. Even this, we shall find proof, would put the cycle about twenty-seven years before the date of its public legal sanction; but Manetho might date it from Thoth, its inventor, and from its introduction among the scientific. The observation of Sothis, from which its reckoning was first practically taken, seems to have been obtained about the summer solstice B.C. 1708, judging both from the statement of Tacitus above referred to, and from a method of calculation which will be afterwards submitted. And this is approximately confirmed by the above deductions from Manetho, which have given the date only four years higher, a difference of estimate within the range of one bissextile day.

One cause of the dislocated and unsatisfactory position of the historical dynasties in relation to the cycle in Manetho's general scheme, is this,—that while he may have had means of knowing the date of his great ancestor and his invention, by documents reasonably not neglected in his family, and from records of astronomical observations, yet, in adjusting the history, he manifestly took the cycle as 1461 years, which complete the grand revolution of the seasons of the Egyptian year as compared with the Julian, but not with the true year. The necessary consequence followed, that the history so adjusted

⁵ Tacit. "Annal." vi. 28. We shall have occasion to consider this and some other data for the computation of the commencement of the cycle in the course of the eighth chapter.

would not square with the true astronomical position of the cycle. For, measured by the true solar year⁶, 1506 years would in reality elapse, instead of 1460, before the equinoxes would return to the same day of the same Egyptian month.

Nevertheless, apart from the perplexing question of the adaptation of the cycle to the history, putting the full numbers of Manetho together according to his general scheme, without deduction of the years of the Persian or Ethiopian reigns, let us observe the result. We are not bound to assume the existence of perfect consistency in Manetho; and the years which are superfluous as regards the cycle, may be deficient in the period before it. The terminating date is the beginning of the Empire of Alexander the Great, and, as the chronology is Egyptian, say the year of the foundation of Alexandria, b.c. 332. Counting back from this date, the sum of these four periods of years, $135 + 1461 + 443 + 817$ (together 2856 years), we are brought to the year b.c. 3188 for the beginning of the reign of the semi-divine kings. This is fifty-eight years later than the Septuagint date of Noah's leaving the Ark, as commonly estimated, which, according to Scaliger and Dr. Hales, and in agreement with the *Chronicon Paschale*, was b.c. 3246. But there is reason to think that in the historical time, as thus collected from this general Manethonian scheme, there is a defect of some years, about equal in amount to the measure there assigned to the Persian dynasty, as will be hereafter shown; and there is also reason

⁶ The reason of this will be obvious to the reader. If not, compare Clinton, "Fasti Hellen.," vol. iii., Introd., p. xvii. On a different estimate of the length of the solar year, he makes the number 1504.

to think that the year above given from Scaliger and Dr. Hales is lower than the true Scriptural date⁷. But thus far at least the chronology of Manetho is not in excess of that of the Septuagint. Nay, it might be even in full accordance with the common reckoning thence; for an allowance of about fifty-eight or sixty years after the date of Noah's leaving the Ark, is just what would be necessary if the reckoning were taken back to the beginning of the patriarchate of Cush, agreeably to what has been remarked in Chapter I.⁸

Taking, then, the numbers of Manetho as they actually stand, without the correction which may afterwards be found proper, they give, as we have seen, B.C. 3188. From that beginning the semi-divine or patriarchal reigns, if measured downwards 817 years, would bring the reckoning to B.C. 2371; about as much lower than the probable date of Nimrod, according to the Septuagint, as the commencing era of the semi-divine kings was lower than the Septuagint date of Noah's leaving the Ark. This brings us, then, to the assumed beginning of the 443 years, the era of the first of the mortal kings of the succession of Menès, who himself was the link with the semi-divine; in which respect his reign may have been liable to some ambiguity, as to whether any part of it should be classed with their period, while he was yet the first, and indeed the founder, of the human. At all events the 443 years

⁷ The Scriptural ground of this statement will appear afterwards. Meanwhile it may be worth mentioning that the Septuagint interval from the Creation to the Birth of Christ, is computed seventy-eight years longer by Abulfaragi than by Scaliger, and eighty-six years longer than by Syncellus and Eutychius.

⁸ Above, p. 39.

which, according to Manetho, begin at this date, belong to the mortal dynasties ; and they are separated from those which follow only because they go with preceding periods, to complete a *supposed* but purely *theoretical* twenty-fourth Canicular Cycle, and thus precede the commencement of the new cycle. They are accounted fifteen generations, because they amount nearly to fifteen thirty-year periods ; and measured from B.C. 2371, they reach down to B.C. 1928.

Now, applying from this point (B.C. 1928), Diodorus's long span of fifty-two native successions, let us measure thence onward fifty-two periods of thirty years (= 1560 years), and add to these thirty-six years nominally allowed for the duration of Ethiopian reigns, in all 1596, and we are brought at once to B.C. 332, the Egyptian date of Alexander the Great and his foundation of Alexandria ! This precision of agreement cannot be by chance. Thus, while the Persian dynasty, with its 135 years, cuts in upon the total duration of the native *reigns*, it does not, according to this general scheme, extend the number of the thirty-year periods, or *generations*, beyond the fifty-two. The 1596 years in fact, in Manetho's general scheme, resolve themselves into 135 + 1461,—the former number being the measure of the Persian dynasty, the other of the Canicular Cycle. Manetho wished to give the impression that his grand Luni-canicular Cycle terminated, and a new one commenced, at the accession of Alexander ; but as the Canicular Cycle did *not* actually terminate at that date, he seems to have disguised the fact by confusing the arrangement of his numbers. It is manifest from the above figures, that the 135 years of the Persian dynasty,

or an *equivalent* number of years, must be taken into account in the general sum: but it is equally manifest, that if the cycle was meant to be understood as terminating at Alexander, the equivalent of the 135 years must have preceded, not followed, the 1461; but then in that case the fictitious *twenty-fourth* Canicular Cycle did not conclude with the 443 years. On the other hand, if we take the twenty-fourth cycle as having concluded with the 443 years, then the twenty-fifth cycle, according to the scheme, would terminate at the accession of the Persian dynasty, 135 years *before* Alexander. The Egyptian high priest has thus managed the horoscope of Ptolemy Philadelphus with a judicious ambiguity, adapting and mystifying the management of the cycle in his general scheme to suit his own purposes, and partly to cover his uncertainty; so that little or nothing definite is to be learned from it as to the true date of the invention or introduction of that cycle in the computation of the Egyptian year. What may with most probability be concluded from it as to this, has been indicated⁹. But it will be shown by and by that his misplacing of the scheme of the dynasties in relation to the cycle has a close connexion with his hesitating and ambiguous confounding of the Shepherd dynasty with the Israelites.

I think it impossible to compare these results with those obtained in the preceding investigation of Diodorus, without coming to the conclusion that we have here, approximately at least, the system of chronology which lay at the basis of the statements of Diodorus, but which had become confused and misunderstood by him and by others, in consequence

⁹ Above, p. 123.

of their mixing it up with a later system of mythical chronology, based, not like this of Manetho, upon the Egyptian year and Canicular Cycle, but upon the Julian year, and Julian Soli-lunar Period of generations.

That the scheme which we have now investigated and restored is Manetho's; and that the different reckoning of thirty or thirty-one *human* dynasties, transmitted under the name of Africanus, and by the interpolators of Eusebius, is falsely ascribed to Manetho and to these writers, it having been made up after a later generation had found it convenient to throw aside his Canicular theory, and to readjust for themselves the divisions of his human dynasties apart from it, so as to admit of incorporating them with the later Julian chronology,—appears both from the fact that the lists ascribed respectively to Eusebius and Africanus divide their dynasties differently from one another and number them differently from one another, showing that their division and numbering are not from Manetho; and also from the plain historical statement, that Manetho's thirty dynasties were counted *inclusive* of those of the gods, semi-divine kings, departed men, and mortals¹. It may

¹ After quoting the dedicatory epistle of Manetho to Ptolemy Philadelphus, of which we have given the substance above, Syncellus adds these words, exactly descriptive of the passage we have been examining. “ταῦτα περὶ τῆς ἐρμηνείας τῶν ἵπο τοῦ δευτέρου Ἐρμοῦ βιβλίων λέγει μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα καὶ περὶ ἔθνων Αἰγυπτιακῶν τέντε ἐν τριάκοντα δυναστείαις ἱστορεῖ, τῶν λεγομένων παρ' αὐτοῖς θεῶν, καὶ ἥμιθέων καὶ νεκύων, καὶ θυητῶν,” Geo. Syncel. Chronogr. ed. Dindorf., p. 73. The singular manner in which certain of the *dead* are here associated with the semi-divine, and distinguished from the *mortal*, is explained by the fifteen generations of mortals who are detached and taken with the semi-divine, to make up the twenty-fourth Canicular Cycle.

be added that the false division of the dynasties, appears to have been unknown to Manetho's somewhat senior contemporary Dicæarchus, unknown to Eratosthenes, unknown to Alexander Polyhistor, unknown to Diodorus, unknown to Josephus—to none of whom Manetho was or could be unknown—unknown to Theophilus of Antioch, and, it must be added, utterly unknown to Eusebius, or else passed over by him in silence as beneath even the notice of contempt. The earliest human dynasty of Manetho quoted or alluded to by Eusebius, is the Sixteenth; and in a passage appropriated by Syncellus, most probably from Eusebius, and which is assigned by Scaliger to the former book of the "Chronica,"—a passage in one particular quoting Manetho, and the genuineness of which there is no reason to question, —THE LAST KING OF THAT DYNASTY, KONKHARIS, IS NUMBERED THE TWENTY-FIFTH IN SUCCESSION FROM THE FIRST HEAD OF THE COLONIZATION OF EGYPT, MIZRAIM. Now Mizraim belonged properly to the period of the semi-divine kings preceding the mortal dynasties of Manetho. Again, in giving the list of Theban kings from Apollodorus and Eratosthenes, there is appended by Scaliger from Eusebius, after the mention of the ninth king, the following note: "Among the Egyptians it was then the Sixteenth dynasty, in which Thebans reigned 160, or, according to some copies, 190 years²." At Thebes the same dynasty lasted uninterruptedly down to the time of the expulsion of the Shepherds, by Amôsis, after which it came to be counted the Eighteenth in Egypt, as following the Seventeenth there, even though it might still for some time be reckoned only as the

² See the words cited above, p. 83, *note*, with remarks there.

Sixteenth at Thebes. But according to that pseudo-Manethonian succession of thirty *human* dynasties, erroneously placed by Scaliger as part of the genuine Greek *sozomena* of Eusebius, there were fully three hundred successive kings before the close of the Sixteenth dynasty! Eusebius was manifestly ignorant of any such incongruity of his statements. If he had furnished the supposed Manethonian succession in his own work, he could not have passed over without remark his utter departure from it. That both Eusebius and Africanus were utterly ignorant of the fabricated succession of dynasties imputed to them respectively, further appears from the Barbarous-Latin extracts, made from their works and others by a writer who appears to have lived in the reign of Theodosius the Great, and who brings his chronology only down to the birth of Honorius. Theodosius died A.D. 395; and the writer referred to, who knows of only sixteen human dynasties, affords us proof that, at least down to the date of the birth of Honorius, the fabricated succession of thirty human dynasties was not in the works of Eusebius, Julius Africanus, Castor, or any of the writers used by him.

The whole succession and summation of these thirty or thirty-one human dynasties, as they stand, are in effect nothing more nor less than A STUPENDOUS LIE put upon Manetho by persons certainly later than the close of the fourth century of the Christian era. It is manifest that at least the first fourteen of these pseudo-Manethonian successive dynasties, though pretended to be transmitted from Africanus and Eusebius, have been fabricated by some later writers, probably out of some of the historical and traditional materials collected and used by Manetho,

since in two places there is reference to the particular volume ; but with an utter alteration of his intention and arrangement, and an absolute falsification of his whole chronology. The commencement of the change may have been in ignorance and confused misunderstanding, but its consummation has not been without fraud. And that the fraud should have passed muster even with the successive chronological transcribers, improvers, or interpolators of Africanus and Eusebius, may be owing to the circumstance that they might not have seen the works of Manetho himself (which was the case with Syncellus), and were not concerned to defend him from the misrepresentation. Nevertheless the distorted and misused tablets which they have transmitted to us under his name, are of some value, as they furnish to us particulars of names and facts, nay a variety of entire lists in duplicate and triplicate, which admit of being applied, apart from their perverted chronology, in illustration of other information ; for they may be a collection of ancient tablets or other records of Egyptian kings ; but that they do not represent one original scheme of successive dynasties, is evident from the difference of the arrangement of the two sets, the difference of the numbers, the difference of the names, and the difference of the spelling of the same names.

We have already traced in the records of Diodorus the beginning of the process of divergence from Manetho's chronology, and the attempt to incorporate its facts with an inconsistent scheme, by transference from the Egyptian year and its Lunar and Canicular Cycles, which formed their old basis of computation, to the Julian year which was then being introduced, and to the Soli-Lunar Cycle of generations, the double of the theoretical Julian

Period³. We have seen this in the vast patch of 475 generations put upon the original series of Menès and the fifty-two successors and the four Ethiopians, to make out with these the full number of 532 generations or Thirty-year Periods, equal to 15,960 years, which is exactly twice the Julian Period, and results from multiplying the Solar Cycle by the Lunar, and that by the space of a generation of thirty years. We now see the sequel of that change in the gradual confusion of Manetho's system, and the ultimate fraud of ignorant and blundering men, altering Manetho's arrangement and chronology, and passing their fabricated schemes under his name.

One thing is manifest, that the genuine chronology of Manetho subsequent to the reign of the gods, is not in excess of the Septuagint chronology of Scripture after the Deluge. Another is probable, that in its main measurements it was even the same. It is not certain that the dates which we now have are exactly the genuine dates of the Septuagint. In the computations of the ancients from the Septuagint they are often not quite in agreement with the numbers now found there, or deduced thence. It is thus quite possible that the beginning of the 817 years of the semi-divine kings is to be taken exactly from Noah's leaving the ark; and the reign of Menès from Nimrod, a century after the dispersion from Babel. But if not, the dates to which we have come, as they have been stated above, are still approximately in general accordance with Scripture.

With regard, however, to some of the more detailed numbers, and the arrangement of the dynasties, in Manetho's general scheme, it will be found that they

³ Above, pp. 55—59.

do not admit of being reconciled with actual history, but that there is some dislocation. It may be remembered that when we were engaged with Diodorus's account of the fifty-two successors of Menès⁴, we found there a manifest historical dislocation; and if his information was derived from Manetho, then that historical dislocation of his might prepare us to expect one here also. It may probably be attributed in the first place to the political confusion and revolutions following the overthrow in the Red Sea, in the second place, to the historical mistake of confounding the Seventeenth or Shepherd dynasty with the Israelites—a mistake which Josephus avowedly derived from Manetho. In consequence of this, the Shepherd dynasty is placed at the commencement of the Canicular Cycle, because that cycle is reckoned as having begun at or about the accession of Sesostris the Great; the same with the centenarian king, throughout whose reign, and that of his next successor, the Israelites were oppressed, and after the death of whose successor their Exodus took place. In the third place, another cause of mistake and chronological dislocation is owing to the measuring of the history by the cycle of 1461 years, rectifying the astronomical date of the introduction of that cycle, but *not* rectifying the historical dates in other respects depending on it. The result of this was necessarily to dislocate the history from the true astronomical measure of time, and to confuse the astronomical date of the cycle with an earlier period of the history. For the actual revolution of the seasons in relation to the Egyptian year had occupied 1506 years, not only 1461. This cause of error con-

⁴ Above, pp. 85—89.

tributed to strengthen the one last noticed, and to hinder its correction.

We shall have occasion to refer to the date of the introduction of the Egyptian year and Canicular Cycle, and to their relation to Sesostris and the time of the Exodus, when we come to consider the catalogue of the kings⁵. It may suffice here to have indicated the causes of the dislocation; and to remark that the confusion produced by that dislocation has extended even to the *historical* position which he assigns to the commencement of the Canicular Cycle. By the numbers contained in the general scheme its commencement, as already remarked, is placed apparently 1596 years (complete) before Alexander the Great, but really subject to a deduction of the 135 years of the Persian dynasty, which brought the number down to 1461 years, an exact Canicular Cycle; and, on closer inspection, subject to a further deduction of 81 years, leaving the cycle not completed at the date of Alexander. This wavering and ambiguous mode of counting it, which was the result of the confusion and dislocation of history which has been mentioned, favoured at the same time the ingenious flattery of identifying the Greek dynasty with the returning cycle of Egypt's ancient glory, as if Alexander had been a renewal of their great Sesostris, or even a recommencement of their whole cycle of divine and semi-divine kings. In the Barbarous-Latin extracts, we have found an express testimony that Manetho counted 1520 years back from his own day to the beginning of the 17th dynasty, which in his general scheme begins the cycle. Now, assuming this to be dated from about

⁵ Chap. VIII.

B.C. 273, the thirteenth year of Ptolemy Philadelphus, it amounts to the same computation as commencing a new Canicular Cycle with Alexander; for 1520 years before B.C. 273 lead to the same year, with 1461 before B.C. 332. But this reckoning was certainly more courtly than correct; for we shall find that the Egyptian year in itself bears witness to the fact that the cycle (as regards its *public* and *legal sanction* in conjunction with the year of 365 days) began B.C. 1685, and terminated, therefore, in the time of the third Ptolemy, Euergetes, B.C. 224, about two years before the close of his reign. Or, if the 1461 years be measured back from the accession of that king, B.C. 247, they conduct us to B.C. 1708, the date of the astronomical observation on which the cycle was practically grounded, as we shall also demonstrate.

CHAPTER V.

EXAMINATION AND CONFUTATION OF OBJECTIONS, RESULTING IN ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE.

IT may be desirable here to notice the very insufficient reasons on which some have rejected the above general scheme of Manetho as spurious, and the chronology it represents as the invention of later persons, by whom its reckoning evidently was not even understood, far less constructed. Those reasons, which are alleged against it as presented by Syncellus, may be found stated in the second volume of Mueller's "Fragmenta Historicorum Græcorum," p. 536. Plathius (Qu. Aeg., p. 46) is quoted, saying that learned men have determined that without doubt Syncellus was deceived in considering it ancient. This "vetus chronicon," as it is called, does not, he dogmatically pronounces, even touch the times of ancient Egypt as Syncellus believed. He holds it more certain than certainty itself, that it was the later fabrication of an Alexandrian Jew or Christian. And why? Because Syncellus said that it affirmed the Egyptians had been called first Aëritæ, afterwards Mestræans, and afterwards at last Egyptians; whereas (as this critic informs us) it appears, both from other sources and from the Rosetta inscription, that Egypt was called nothing but Chemi or Keme

by its inhabitants, and that Aëria is a name of Egypt which it received from the *Greeks*, while Mestræa is the *Hebrew* name of Egypt. Further, that the author of that “*vetus chronicon*” was either a Greek or conversant with Greek ideas, he thinks is proved by the mention of the twelve gods. But what finishes the business, he observes, is this—that the author of this “*chronicon*” agrees with Eusebius even in those places in which we know (?) that Eusebius had corrupted Manetho; as for instance in the 16th, 17th, 18th, 19th, 22nd, and 25th dynasties; so that Des Vignoles, p. 659, has rightly determined that its author is later than Eusebius. Boeckh adds other arguments to these (pp. 53, sqq.) and thinks that the chronicle was written in the time which intervened between Eusebius and Panodorus. Letronne had previously shown that it was by some Christian Jew, who lived after Claudius Ptolemy, and wished to accommodate the times of the Egyptians to the sacred chronology¹.

In regard to this piece of criticism, strong in assertion, feeble in reason, we shall first deal with the more important statements towards its close which have regard to the date of the document. No doubt indeed these have been judiciously reserved by the objectors to the close; because, apart from the other frivolous objections, they have no ground to rest upon; and surely otherwise they would not have been displaced from the position of being primary in consideration.

It is not, then, attempted to be denied that this Canicular scheme of the Manethonian chronology existed and was reasoned upon in the time of Anianus

¹ Mueller’s *Fragmenta Historicorum Græcorum*, Par. 1841—1851, vol. ii., p. 536.

and Panodorus, Egyptian monks who flourished in the patriarchate of Theophilus of Alexandria. The duration of that patriarchate was from A.D. 385 to A.D. 412, having commenced within forty-five years, and terminated within seventy-two years, of the death of Eusebius. We learn from Syncellus that these monks applied *inversely* the year-day system implied or suggested in the Egyptian mythic chronology based on the Canicular Cycle², to resolve some altogether *foreign* periods of vast extent, by treating the years of the supposed Chaldean *saroses* as having been only literal days; and that they censured Eusebius for not having seen and applied this *inverse* principle of theirs, thinking that he ought to have discovered it from the Egyptian chronological scheme which was before him. Clearly therefore they knew that Eusebius had this Manethonian scheme before him, or else they could not have so censured him. Syncellus, on the other hand, defends Eusebius on the ground that that learned author well knew the mythic chronology of the Egyptians and Greeks, and their theoretical application of the Canicular Cycle, and therefore did not, as he could not possibly on any such ground, imagine, with Anianus and Panodorus, that a time had ever been when the year had in any nation literally consisted of a day, as had been supposed by them of the Chaldean periods called *saroses*, before the Flood. It is clear then, from the argument, that these monks knew the Canicular Cyclical system of the Egyptians, as it is applied in the Manethonian scheme under our consideration; and, that, living within about fifty years of the time of Eusebius, they also knew that

² See above, p. 114.

Eusebius had it before him, since they blamed him for not having applied it *inversely* to the resolution of those immense Chaldean periods of innumerable *saroses*, the supposed existence of which, we shall by and by find, rests on their mistake of a passage of Alexander Polyhistor. Syncellus himself did not for a moment doubt that Eusebius had that Egyptian Canicular scheme before him, that he viewed it as received from Manetho, and understood it as constructed on a principle of theoretical expansion of time, but not therefore applicable *inversely* to the reduction of years into literal days, especially for any supposed foreign periods, such as those of the Chaldeans. I think also that he writes as one who knew and means us to believe that the explanatory annotation upon it, which we have noticed, drawn from the Genica of Hermes and the Cyranic books, is from the pen and varied learning of Eusebius³.

³ The passages of Syncellus referring to this subject have been brought together and remarked upon by Scaliger, in his notes on the Greek of Eusebius, *Thesaur. Temp.*, p. 406. The two following contain all that applies to our subject:—

Ἄλλὰ ὁ μὲν Βηρωστὸς διὰ σάρων καὶ νύρων καὶ σώσσων ἀνεγράψατο, ὃν ὁ μὲν Σάρος γχ' ἔτῶν, ὃ δὲ Νῆρος ἔτῶν χ' ὃ δὲ Σώσων ξ'. καὶ συνήξει σάρους ρκ' διὰ βασιλέων δέκα, ἤτοι χρόνον ἔτῶν μυριάδων μγ' καὶ β'. ταῦτα δὲ ἔτη τινὲς τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς ἱστορικῶν ἡμέρας ἐλογίσαντο, στοχαστικῶς μεμφάμενοι τὸν Παμφίλον Εὐσέβιον, ὃς μὴ νοήσαντα τὰ ἔτη τῶν Σάρων ἡμέρας. μάτην δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν τούτῳ μέμφονται. πῶς γὰρ τὸ μὴ ὃν ἔχει νοῆσαι, πολυμαθῆς ὁν, καὶ εἰδὼς τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν δόξαν πολλοὺς αἴώνας ὅμολογούσαν ἤτοι μυριάδας ἔτῶν παρεληλυθέναι ἀπὸ τῆς κοσμικῆς γενέσεως, κατὰ τὴν παρ' αὐτοῖς μυθικὴν τοῦ ζωδιακοῦ ἐπὶ τὰ ἐναντία κίνησιν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Κριοῦ, καὶ πάλιν εἰς αὐτὴν ἀποκατάστασιν.

“Nimirum τινὲς τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς ἱστορικῶν intelliguntur Ἀνιάνος καὶ Πανόδωρος, μονάζοντες ὅμοχρονοι, ἐπὶ Θεοφίλον τοῦ κβ' ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ἀλεξανδρείας ἀκμάσαντες, ut idem Georgius alibi scribit.” *Scalig.*

‘Αμφότεροι δὲ αὐτῶν (Πανόδωρος καὶ Ἀνιάνος) τὸν Καισαρέας Παλαιστίνης Εὐσέβιον καταμέμφονται, ὅτι μὴ δεδύνηται ὡς αὐτοὶ τὸν μυριαδισμὸν τῶν Χαλδαϊκῶν ἔτῶν, ἤτοι τῶν ρκ' σάρων, εἰς ἡμέρας

It was probably in consequence of not distinguishing that explanatory comment of Eusebius at the close, from the Manethonian document to which it was annexed, that some distinguished men whose names have been mentioned were led to suspect its genuineness; which others, following their authority, converted into rejection. So far, then, from affording any evidence of its having been concocted subsequently to Eusebius, Anianus and Panodorus afford express evidence to the contrary. But though they thought that Eusebius had not made the most of it, it does not appear that they themselves had any just understanding of its principle and structure; or that any man of that age, or since the Julian alteration of the Kalendar, showed such an understanding of it, as to be justly supposed capable of having invented it. The reader may partly judge of this from what has been shown in treating of the structure of it in the preceding chapter.

There is a passage of Iamblichus which affords

νοῆσαι, καὶ ἀναλύσεις, ἢ μερίσεις (ὡς αὐτοὶ πεποίκασιν, ὡς προδέδεικται), ἵνα σύμφωνος εὑρεθῇ τῇ γραφῇ ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀποδεχόμεθα μὴ συμβιβάσαντα τὸ ψεῦδος τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. πολυμαθής γὰρ ὁν, καὶ εἰδὼς Χαλδαίους ἀπείρους αἰώνων τῆς κοσμογονίας γεγούτας, "Ελληνας δὲ καὶ Αἰγυπτίους ἐν εἴκοσι πέντε περιόδοις ἐπών λέγοντας τῶν ἀπὸ αὐξά, ἤτοι ἐν λίστῃ χιλιάσι καὶ φκέ, τὴν κοσμικὴν ἀποκατάστασιν, ὡς ἐν τοῖς Γενικοῖς Ἐρμοῦ καὶ ταῖς Κυρανίσι φέρεται, τούτους χάριν περιττὸν ἡγήσατο τὰς ἀλλοτρίας δόξας ἀλληγορῆσαι, ὡς ἔοικεν.

"Hactenus Georgius" (remarks Scaliger), "quæ certe non sunt pabula plebeiorum ingeniorum. Ideo hæc ii soli legent, qui hæc discere a natura comparati sunt, non qui nolunt et quidem, si velint, non possunt."

The same subject may be found further referred to by Syncellus in other passages, as ed. Dindorf, vol. i. p. 147—149, in which these monks are alluded to under the name *τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ τῶν ἀμφ' αὐτὸν τὰς ἡμέρας ἔτη καταριθμούντων*. It is only by a very loose manner of speech that Alexander Polyhistor seems as if here included with these his erroneous commentators.

an indirect indication of the existence of the same theoretical multiple of the Canicular Cycle, if not in the time of Manetho, certainly in the days of Eusebius with whom Iamblichus was contemporary, for he died probably about A.D. 333. He says⁴ that Manetho ascribed to Hermes 36,525 books exhibiting the general principles of the Universe; the *number* is the same, though transferred to another subject to which it could not be literally applicable. Clement of Alexandria states the number of the books of Hermes publicly recognized in Egypt, at 42⁵. The peculiar numerical scheme, however, is thus traced back at least as far as to Eusebius's day, while there is not a shadow of contrary proof to show against the direct statements that he knew it, and transmitted it as that of Manetho; and it becomes necessary therefore for our critics to assume that Eusebius, with all his varied learning and opportunities, was utterly deceived in it by a flagrant and recent imposture, so transparent that even they could prove it such at this late period. But we may go further: probably

⁴ Τὰς μὲν οὖν δόλας [sc. ἀρχὰς] Ἐρμῆς ἐν ταῖς δισμυρίαις βίβλοις, ὡς Σέλευκος ἀπεγράψατο, ἡ ταῖς τρισμυρίαις τε καὶ ἔξακισχιλίαις καὶ πεντακοσίαις καὶ εἴκοσι πέντε ὡς Μανεθῶς ἱστορεῖ, τελέως ἀνθεῖξε. Iambl. “De Myst.” Sect. viii. c. 1, ed. Gale, Oxon. 1678, p. 157. These “books” were all exhibiting only the *general* or *universal* principles, and therefore brief outlines. The editor Gale remarks with reason, “Porro quæ sunt Iamblichio βίβλοι, revera λόγοι erant.” Probably they were, as suggested above, tables or schemes of the Egyptian year, in relation to the seasons, the stars, and the moon, calculated on the Luni-Canicular Cycle of 36,525 years. Seleucus the Mathematician was a contemporary of Vespasian, and his statement alluded to is most likely only an imperfect and vague echo of Manetho's not understood.

⁵ Clem. Alex. “Strom.” v., ed. Sylburg, 1641, p. 633. A catalogue and description of the Hermetic books which were publicly recognized in Egypt, is given in the place here cited.

the boast of Manetho to which Iamblichus alluded, may have really meant that by the invention of that great Luni-Canicular Cycle and the tables belonging to it, his great ancestor, the second Hermes, had as good as furnished an almanac for every year of the 36,525, equivalent to writing that number of such books. Thus the statement is reconciled to reason and truth; and thus that great cycle is referred no doubt to its genuine author.

It is evident further, in regard to Manetho's historical and chronological use of the scheme, that Eusebius, or an ancient author understood to be he, as quoted and used by Syncellus⁶, was alluding to it in what he says of the *Sixteenth dynasty having fallen within the past Canicular Cycle according to Manetho*; which he does in mentioning the reign of Konkharis, the twenty-fifth king from Mizraim. The list of kings in which Konkharis was the twenty-fifth, which is ascribed to Eusebius by Scaliger⁷, has been framed by Syncellus from the authorities he had before him, beginning with Eusebius, whose works were the principal source from which the subsequent writers feathered themselves; and it follows directly in connexion with passages expressly quoted from Eusebius, in which he had mentioned the chronology of the Samaritan Pentateuch, and discussed it in comparison with that of the Hebrew and Septuagint, from the Flood down to the times of Mizraim, of the dispersion of mankind, and of Nimrod the son of Cush⁸. Even

⁶ Syncel. Chronogr. ed. Dindorf. vol. i. p. 74.

⁷ Thesaur. Temp., Gr. p. 21. The list is given from Bunsen, after Syncellus, "Mulleri Frgm." ii. 607.

⁸ This list of Egyptian kings, furnished by Syncellus, certainly contains a groundwork of information from Eusebius, and through him from Manetho, whose own works Syncellus himself had not

in the Armenian version of Eusebius (on which we lay but little stress), though it does not contain the

before him, otherwise he would have furnished the dynasties thence and not from two varying sources; but it is evident that, particularly in the later portions of this list of kings, he has been misled by the spurious reckoning of the thirty human dynasties as successive. The judgment of Scaliger as to it will be found in his notes, p. 412, at the foot of Column 2. How much pains Syncellus took to fix the commencement of this series of kings, according to his reckoning of the year of the world, 2776, may be noted in the following passages, of which I give the pages from the first volume of Dindorf's edition. His anxiety to fix its exact commencement, according to the data on which he was working from Eusebius's comparison of the Septuagint, Samaritan, and Hebrew, shows that he thought he set out on reliable information, which was no doubt from Eusebius. But he has interpolated the earlier portion by the insertion of names which are apocryphal, corrupted the middle by misplacing names, and made up the latter part by a total dislocation of history based on the spurious succession of dynasties. See an instance in the note at the foot of Column II. of my *Conspectus* of the dynasties.

P. 149. Ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ βψος' ἔτους, ὅπερ ἦν τοῦ Ἀρφαξὰδ λδ τῆς ἡγεμονίας, ἔχοντες, τῆς δὲ γενέσεως τῷ Φαλέκ ἔτος ε', ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν τότε τῶν Χαλδαίων βασιλείαν, ἡς πρῶτος Εἰνίχιος ὁ καὶ Νεβρὰδ ἡγήσατο, φαμὲν κατάρχασθαι, καὶ τὴν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων, ἡς καὶ αὐτῆς πρῶτος ὁ οἰκιστὴς Αἰγύπτου Μεστραὶμ ἐβασίλευσε.

P. 168. Τῷ βψος' ἔτει τοῦ κόσμου ἡ διασπορὰ τῶν οβ' ἐθνῶν¹ γέγονε, Φαλέκ δὲ ἦν ἐτῶν ε'.

P. 170. Τῷ βψος' ἔτει τοῦ κόσμου ὁ πρῶτος οἰκήσας τὴν Μεστραῖαν χώραν ἦτοι Αἰγυπτον ἐβασίλευσεν ἐν αὐτῇ πρῶτος ἔτη λέ.

Αἰγύπτου τῆς πάλαι Μεστραίας βασιλέων ἔτη.

α' Μεστραὶμ ὁ καὶ Μίρνης ἔτη λέ.

Αἰγύπτου δεύτερος ἐβασίλευσε Κουράδης [l. Νευρώδης, i. e. Νευρὸδ, v. Νεβρὰδ²,] ἔτη ξγ', &c.

¹ Syncellus seems to have got the 72 nations of the Dispersion from Epiphanius, apud "Chron. Pasch." p. 32.

² There are ancient forms of K and N which might be mistaken; and the form Νευρὸδ for the name Νεβρὰδ, or Nimrod, may be found exemplified, "Thesaur. Temp." Gr. p. 11; where he is said to have been called by the Babylonians Εἰνίχοος, as also above, Εἰνίχιος, a name of Bacchus?

list of the Egyptian kings just referred to, there is yet a sufficient recognition of the fact that Eusebius had the same general Manethonian scheme before him; as we discover plainly in a very corrupt account of the Manethonian chronology, confusedly mixed up with particulars drawn probably from other parts of Manetho's historical works, and interspersed with interpretation on a false theory, according to which the years are treated as months. Possibly the learned Egyptian priest may have shuffled his cards so as intentionally to puzzle his readers; but though the passage of the Armenian version now referred to cannot accurately represent Eusebius, we gather from it one or two points indicating its nature and source. It is given at page 200 of that version, in the Latin rendering, under the heading, “*Ex Manethi Aegyptiacis monumentis qui tribus tomis contexuit commentaria de diis, semideis et manibus, atque mortalibus, qui Aegyptiis imperarunt usque ad Darium regem Persarum.*” Take the following:—“Protractum est regnum [deorum] usque ad Bitem

And, in continuation of this list, at p. 193.

Αἰγυπτίων ἐβασίλευσε κε' Κογχάρις ἔτη ε'.

Τούτῳ τῷ ε' ἔτει τοῦ κε' βασιλεύσαντος Κογχάρεως τῆς Αἰγύπτου ἐπὶ τῆς ιε' δυναστείας τοῦ κυνικοῦ λεγομένου [γεγενημένου, Scal.] κύκλου παρὰ τῷ Μανεθῷ, ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου βασιλέως καὶ οἰκιστοῦ Μεστραίμ πληροῦνται ἔτη ψ', βασιλέων κε',—τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τοῦ καθολικοῦ κοσμικοῦ βίφος' ἔτους καθ' ὃν χρόνον ἡ διασπορὰ γέγονεν, &c. The words at the end, τοῦτ' ἐστὶν, &c., are obviously an explanatory comment of Syncellus, in continuation of his wish to mark the date of commencement of this ancient list of the kings of Egypt agreeably to his reckoning of the years of the world, as above shown. Reasonings and passages, taken verbatim from Eusebius, will be found interspersed, pp. 165, 166, 168, &c. Scaliger gives the passage in his “*Thesaur. Temp.*” Gr. p. 21.

[Butem, *Mai.*] in spatio annorum [ter]⁹ myriadis triumque millium et nongentorum. . . . Post deos regnavit gens semideorum annis MCCLV. [qu. MCCLX. ?]. Atque item alii reges dominati sunt annis MDCCCXVII." The first of these numbers, 33,900, may be compared with the 33,804 years assigned to the gods in the Manethonian scheme. The second, 1255, may be compared with the reign of the demigods in that scheme, supplemented by the period there assigned to make out the cycle, $817 + 443 = 1260$ [read MCCLX.]. In the third number, 1817, the same supplementary 443 years may perhaps have been taken over again, as belonging properly to the human kings ; under deduction of which the period would be 1474, suggesting, though inaccurately, the Canicular Cycle ; and the sum of the three periods would thus be 36,629 or 36,634, being less by 32 or 27 years than the sum of the years contained in the extract as we have given it in the preceding chapter, which exceeded twenty-five Canicular Cycles by the measure of the Persian dynasty, 135 years ; while this exceeds twenty-five cycles only by 103 or 108 years. The period of the gods is given in excess ; that of the mortal kings in defect. So far therefore as the evidence of the Armenian Eusebius is to be considered, it is corroborative of the genuineness of this Manethonian scheme, which is destructive of the pretensions of that spurious succession of dynasties found there also.

To these considerations may be added the allusion to this Sothic scheme contained in the following extract from Julius Africanus :—"The Egyptians,"

⁹ This little word, or the corresponding numeral mark, seems to have been omitted from the recurrence of the same multiplier for the thousands.

says he, “ for greater boastfulness of antiquity, made an array of superfluous cycles and myriads of years, according to a certain scheme of those among them who astrologize¹, ” &c. I submit that these words are descriptive of that Manethonian Canicular scheme which we have under review, and that the evidence here occurring of its existence in the time of Africanus is not the less satisfactory from being quite incidental and indirect. That Manetho astrologized, there is sufficient proof. The same might be said of all their astronomers. Taken with the other evidence, it is conclusive against those learned critics who pretended that that scheme was fabricated in the interval between Eusebius and Panodorus. It thus leaves us with the evidence of Eusebius and Africanus in its favour, as Egyptian and Manethonian. On the other hand, what is there to show to the contrary?

Upon the remaining statements and objections of this erroneous piece of criticism, it may be observed, first, that it is not the fact that the Manethonian fragment quoted by Syncellus, and miscalled the *vetus chronicon*, affirmed the Egyptians to have been called first Aëritæ, then Mestræans, lastly Egyptians. What is really affirmed by Syncellus is, that it treated of five *races* of *kings* by whom Egypt had been ruled; the first two of whom were no doubt the divine and semi-divine; but the mortal rulers it mentioned as having been of these three dynastic races: first Aÿrite or Aürite (not Aërite), next Mestræan, lastly Egyptian. The passage is written

¹ Αφρικανοῦ περὶ τῆς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων καὶ Χαλδαίων μυθώδους χρονολογίας. Αἰγύπτιοι μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ τὸ κομπωδέστερον χρόνων περιττὰς περιόδους καὶ μυριάδας ἐτῶν κατὰ θέσιν τινὰ τῶν παρ’ αὐτοῖς ἀστρολογούμενων ἔξεθεντο, &c., apud Scalig. “ Thesaur. Temp.” Gr. p. 8.

in Greek, and therefore it is obvious that even if all the three names were of Greek form, it would make nothing against the correctness of its statement. But it is not proved that the name Aýrite is of Greek origin², or that a name properly corresponding to it was unknown to the ancient Egyptians, as the designation of a race of kings; neither is it proved that the native Egyptians knew no name of their country but Chemi³, far less that they were ignorant

² We find the appellation of “the Aërian land” made use of by Æschylus in relation to Egypt, *φυγὰς Αέριας ἀπὸ γῆς* (“Suppl.” 75); but it were as easy to affirm that this is a corruption of the word Aýrian or Aýrite, equivalent to Athyrian or Osirian, as that that is a corruption of Aërian. The Assyrian supremacy was in the hands of Nimrod; and it was claimed by his Egyptian successors. The title Bousiris was hereditary among them. The name Assyrian is found softened into Athyrian; why not still further into Aýrian? The information of Æschylus was plainly not confined to Greek sources; but, living in the glorious period when the Persian invasion of Greece was repelled, and the invaders despoiled, he had manifestly obtained information from Persian and Egyptian sources which is historically valuable. The use of the name Aërian by Æschylus, is therefore not at variance with the origin of that word which has been now suggested. We know that that name was extended not only to Egypt, but to other Mediterranean countries and islands; and we find, from the traditional story of Picus (Pi-Cûs), that in his day the Assyrian Empire in the West was understood to embrace these Mediterranean countries, including Italy (*Chron. Pasch.*, p. 37), while the Cretan Minotaur seems to receive some illustration from the Nineveh Marbles, as the Assyrian emblem. Of the word Aëria, Jablonski says, “*Fuit hoc vetustissimum nomen Aegypti, non Græcum.*”

³ I know of no apparent authority for this statement, unless it be in these words of Jablonski. “*Ægyptii, sermone suo patro, regionem suam semper, etiam in versione Vet. et Novi Testamenti, appellant Chemi, vel ut Copti pronunciare solent, Chami.*” Jabl. “*Panth. Æg.*” lib. i. c. 4, p. 97. But this is universally affirmative of the name *Chemi*; not necessarily *negative of all others*;

of the descent of some of their kings from Mizraim, the son of Ham; and if the origin of the Shepherd dynasty was from a branch of the same race with the Philistines, the classification is at once accounted for and justified. Then, in regard to another of the objections, we learn from Herodotus that the ancient Egyptians *had* their twelve gods. It requires some hardihood therefore to assume that they were without that mystic zodiac; and if it is the fact that the author of that scheme of the old chronology was acquainted with Greek ideas, in what manner does that invalidate it? The author of it, Manetho, though professing to draw his information from ancient Egyptian sources, as being himself an Egyptian and their native high priest, nevertheless was writing for the Greek king, Ptolemy Philadelphus, by that Greek king's command, and in the Greek language. What shall we think of the learned critic who has found in this the discovery of an invincible objection to its genuineness? Behold with how little wisdom the world of literature is ruled! A baseless judgment like this would scarcely pass muster in any other kingdom or republic under the sun; but here it is promulgated by Plathius, and enshrined by the learned Mueller! And lo, under the shadow of great names, the world of literature receive the dictum as from the throne of Ancient Night!

But further, the Epistle Dedicatory of Manetho to Ptolemy Philadelphus, presenting to him his history, beginning in the first volume with the chronological scheme founded on the Sothic Cycle, and applying it

and it is *modern*, not *ancient*, testimony. See further the Catalogue of the Egyptian Kings, in Chap. X. The name Athyria is actually found applied to the last retained portion of the Shepherd dominion in Egypt.

to the kingdom of the gods and demigods, is impugned by the same learned authorities as a fabrication, for reasons equally frivolous ; namely,—

First, because in the words introducing the Epistle, or in the superscription or title placed over it, Ptolemy Philadelphus is called Σεβαστὸς, which, it is alleged, manifestly indicates the time of the Roman emperors. To this we have replied, in the first place, that though Σεβαστὸς was adopted by the Roman emperors as the Greek equivalent of *Augustus*, yet it expresses ideas not contained in that Latin title—ideas of divine honours and worship rendered to the sovereign as a σέβασμα ; and it thus owes its origin to the Oriental and Egyptian monarch-worship which was introduced among the Greeks by Alexander the Great, and thence transferred afterwards, in the Roman Empire, to the Cæsars. It is not of Roman origin, but might be applied without any incongruity as an epithet in speaking of one of the Greek monarchs. And, in the second place, it is replied, that the title is not used by Manetho in the letter in question, though it occurs in the title or mention of it prefixed ; and the title or mention, being no part of the letter, might surely be written by the hand of the person who made the extract, without affecting the genuineness of the letter to which it is prefixed.

Secondly, It is objected that the epithet, Trismegistos, applied to Hermes, appears foreign to the times of Ptolemy Philadelphus ; that the first example of that title occurs in the Rosetta inscription ; but most frequently the name is used in the Hermetic books, of which the greater part were composed in the third century after Christ. Therefore (the objectors continue) those most illustrious men, Letronne (*Recueil des Inscr. gr. et lat. de l'Egypte*, tom. i. pp. 206. 283, &c.) and Boeckh (*Ma-*

netho u. die Hundssternperiode, Berlin, 1845, p. 15), suspect that this Epistle is to be assigned to the same period. (Mulleri "Fragm. Hist. Gr." ii. 512.) The writer is accordingly to be hanged on suspicion.

To this it may be replied, that the special epithet of Thoth or Hermes which in the time of Ptolemy Epiphanes was written on the Rosetta Stone, and which is there rendered in the Greek portion of that inscription '*Ἐρμῆς ὁ μέγας καὶ μέγας*', may very well have been in existence in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, there being not a shadow of evidence to show that it was introduced as a *new* and *previously unknown* title in the Rosetta inscription ; and if the authors of the spurious Hermetic books adopted and made use of that title, it is quite as likely that they adopted it *because* they knew it to be ancient, though they may have put a new construction on its meaning and origin⁴ ; for how should they have hoped to give plausibility and currency to their books by the adoption of a new and unheard-of title ? Gay, in his fable, gives a sounder principle, and it is one seldom lost sight of by forgers,—

⁴ Such may be the source of the spurious account of the meaning and derivation of the title Trismegistos, in the "Chronicon Paschale," where it is referred to his doctrine of the Trinity. *Ἐν τοῦ χρόνου τῆς βασιλείας Σέσωστρις, ἦν Ἐρμῆς ὁ Τρισμέγιστος ὁ Αἰγύπτιος, ἀνὴρ φοβερὸς ἐν σοφίᾳ, ὅστις ἔφρασεν τρεῖς μεγίστας Δυνάμεις εἶναι, τὸ τοῦ ἀρρήτου καὶ δημιουργοῦ Θεοῦ ὅνομα μίαν Θεότητα εἶπεν εἶναι. Διὸ καὶ ἐκλήθη ἀπὸ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων Τρισμέγιστος Ἐρμῆς.* "Chron. Pasch." ed. Ducange, p. 47. But no shadow of any sanction for this derivation can be traced in the use of it on the Rosetta Stone ; and the adoption of an erroneous derivation and interpretation of it in the passage above cited, is nothing against the value of the statement there made, that he flourished in the period of the reign of Sesostris. If so, he seems to have been the *third* Hermes (*third, and thrice greatest*), judging from the mention of the *second* Hermes, cited in next paragraph.

“ Whene’er you wish your story true,
Keep probability in view.”

But, further, if the title of Trismegistos were supposed to be not so ancient, it would only invalidate the reading of that word, and not of the letter in which it occurs. One might suppose in that case, that the reading had been ὑπὸ τοῦ προπάτορός μου [or τοῦ], μεγίστου Ἐρμοῦ; and that μου or τοῦ, in a careless running hand, had been combined with the word following, and read as the word τρισμεγίστου, familiar to the reader and transcriber of the day.

Thirdly, an objection is raised on the following circumstances. We learn from Syncellus, speaking in relation to this very passage, that Manetho got the information for his ancient Chronology, as he stated, “ from PILLARS situated in the Seriadic land, bearing inscriptions in the sacred dialect and in hieroglyphic characters, by Thoth the first Hermes, and which were interpreted after the overwhelming in the waters, out of the sacred dialect into the Greek tongue—records which had, moreover, in hieroglyphic characters, been laid up in books by the second Hermes, the son of Agathodæmon (Kneph⁵), and father of Tat (Taaut, the third Hermes ?), in the shrines of the temples of Egypt.”—Of these three Hermeses, the second may have been the regent Tethmôsis, or Thoth-Amôsis, who reigned in the

⁵ Kneph is *Agathodæmon*, vid. Jablonski “Panth. Ægypt.” lib. i. c. 4. Φοίνικες δὲ αὐτὸ ἀγαθὸν δαίμονα καλοῦσιν ὄμοιως, καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι Κνῆφ ἐπονομάζουσι, Euseb. “Præp. Evang.” i. 10, p. 41. The divinity whose name he bore was represented with the head of a hawk, and as a winged circle of a serpent, having a hawk’s form of head. “Affinis est Hebræa vox נְבָנָה, id est ala, quæ præcipuum a Porphyrio numinis hujus insigne ponitur,” Vigeri Notæ, p. 8, *ibid.*

minority of the young Sesostris; and who would thus appear to have been son, or perhaps only successor (Sanchoniatho makes him brother or kinsman), of *Kneph-Akhthos*. The third flourished in the reign of Sesostris.—“The information, thus acquired, Manetho addressed to King Philadelphus, the second Ptolemy, in the book of Sothis, writing word for word as follows⁶ :” (and then the letter is given). But, according to our learned critics, Egypt had no γῆν Σηριαδικὴν, no Seriadic district, and knew nothing of the Deluge; and further, the old mythology of the Egyptians did not recognize two Hermeses; so that these statements cannot be Manetho’s, nor yet can the passage which Syncellus introduces by the mention of them.

Now, some confusion in the manner of statement in this passage is attributable to Syncellus’s not very clear understanding; and it is on Syncellus, not on Manetho, that the absurdities charged on it by the illustrious Bishop Stillingfleet⁷ ought justly

⁶ As the passage is somewhat involved in one part, I give it from Syncellus, ed. Dindorf. vol. i. p. 72, 73.

Πρόκειται δὲ λοιπὸν καὶ περὶ τῆς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων δυναστείας μικρὰ διαλαβεῖν ἐκ τῶν Μανεθῶ τοῦ Σεβενύτου, ὃς ἐπὶ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Φιλαδέλφου ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ εἰδωλείων χρηματίσας, ἐκ τῶν ἐν τῇ Σηριαδικῇ γῆν κεμένων στηλῶν, ιερᾶ (φροῖ) διαλέκτῳ καὶ ιερογραφικοῖς γράμμασι κεχαρακτηρισμένων ὑπὸ Θῶθ τοῦ πρώτου Ἐρμοῦ, καὶ ἐρμηνευθεισῶν μετὰ τὸν κατακλυσμὸν ἐκ τῆς ιερᾶς διαλέκτου εἰς τὴν Ἑλληνίδα φωνὴν,—γράμμασιν ιερογλυφικοῖς [δὲ] καὶ ἀποτεθέντων ἐν βίβλοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀγαθοδαίμονος νίον, τοῦ δευτέρου Ἐρμοῦ, πατρὸς δὲ τοῦ Τὰτ, ἐν τοῖς ἀδύτοις τῶν ιερῶν Αἰγύπτου,—προσεφώνησε τῷ αὐτῷ Φιλαδέλφῳ βασιλεῖ δευτέρῳ Πτολεμαίῳ ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ τῆς Σάθεως γράφων ἐπὶ λέξεως οὐτως.

Ἐπιστολὴ Μανεθῶ τοῦ Σεβενύτου πρὸς Πτολεμαῖον τὸν Φιλάδελφον. &c.

⁷ “*Origines Sacræ*,” B. i. ch. 2, § 2. The objections of Bishop Stillingfleet apply to the Chronology of Manetho *in toto*, and the

to be fastened. In other points regarding the fragments of Manetho, we have seen the stupidity of Syncellus leading the way in a series of misappre-

statement now before us is censured only incidentally. The passage is curious as illustrating an earlier stage of criticism, not now tenable, particularly as to hieroglyphics.

“The plain impossibilities,” says he, “are, first, that Manetho should transcribe his dynasties from the beginning of the history of Egypt, to almost the time of Alexander, out of sacred inscriptions of Thoyth, who lived in the beginning of the very first dynasty according to his own computation. Sure, this Thoyth was an excellent prophet, to write an history for about 50,000 years to come, as Manetho reckons it. Secondly, it is as well still that his history after the flood should be translated into Hieroglyphic characters. What kind of translation is that? We had thought that Hieroglyphics had been representations of things, and not of sounds and letters or words. How could this history have been written in any tongue, when it was in hieroglyphics? Do hieroglyphics speak in several languages, and are they capable of changing their tongues? But, thirdly, it is as good still that the second Mercury, or Agathodæmon, did translate this history so soon after the flood into Greek. Was the Greek tongue so soon in request after the flood, that the Egyptian history for the sake of the Greeks must be translated into their language? Nay, is it not evident from Herodotus and Diodorus, that the Grecians were not permitted so much as any commerce with the Egyptians till the time of Psammeticus, which fell out in the twenty-sixth dynasty of Manetho, and about a century after the beginning of the Olympiads? We see then how credible an author Manetho is, and what truth there is like to be in the account of ancient times given by the Egyptian histories, when the very chief of them so lamentably and ominously stumbles in his very entrance into it.” It will be seen that most of the Bishop’s objections are turned aside by a more careful reading and punctuation of the passage. They are all indeed a tissue of mistakes, which the reader will easily detect from the data which have been given. But the passage is vigorous, and the criticism it contains scarcely more out of date than are henceforth the other more recent critical objections which it has been necessary to notice and reply to in this chapter.

hensions which have lasted through the long ages subsequent. Deceived by accepting as Manetho's the fabricated succession of dynasties which are transmitted erroneously under the names of Eusebius and Africanus, and being of course unable to reconcile these with the original scheme of the Manethonian dynasties above presented, he was perplexed, not having before him Manetho's own works, but only those of compilers. The documents which we have been examining purport upon the face of them to be extracts from Manetho ; and Syncellus saw that Manetho had evidently set out from these as his starting-point (*ἐκ τούτων δηλαδὴ λαβὼν τὰς ἀφορμάς*). But the inconsistency of those fabricated successions of dynasties, which probably before the time of Syncellus had come to be accepted as genuine, led him to the mistake that Manetho's *general scheme*, above considered, was some older chronography, which Manetho had found existing among the Egyptians ; and into this opinion he slid by the grammatical blunder of supposing *κατὰ τὸ παλαιὸν χρονικὸν* to mean *κατὰ παλαιόν τι χρονογραφεῖον*, by which he misled all later critics. He was right in his conclusion, that that chronological scheme of history was older than the fabricated succession of thirty *human* dynasties, and lay at the basis of that later fabrication : he was wrong in supposing that it existed prior to Manetho. And now, in the place before us, he gives us a confused and muddled account of some of the ancient authorities from which Manetho mentioned that he had worked. Yet the fact that this perplexity of Syncellus is not justly chargeable on Manetho, does not relieve us of the duty of replying to the objections founded on the statement as to those pillars in the Seriadic land,

and as to the deluge, and the Greek translation, and the hieroglyphics. It may be replied, therefore, as to these,—

1st. That the appellation **Σηριαδικὴ** (Seriadic) may be a derivative from Siris, an Ethiopian name of the Nile, and may mean the district where the Nile begins to spread, particularly in the period of the inundation; the district from the apex of the Delta downwards, through the country which Herodotus calls “the gift of the river.”

The expression of Aeschylus, where he calls this portion of Egypt “the triangular NILOTIC land,” may be thus simply a translation of an earlier name—“THE SIRIAD,” or “THE SIRIADIC LAND”—before the river **SIRIS**⁸, or **AITHIOPS**¹, had received the name of the **NILE**. The overflow of the river was connected by the Egyptians with the rising of the star **SIRIUS**: *τὸν Νεῖλον φασὶ κατὰ τὸν τοῦ Σειρίου ἀστρου ἐπιβολὴν, ἐν φανταστικῷ μαλιστα εἰωθε πληροῦσθαι, &c.*²; so that it were not to be wondered if the star also had taken this name from the river, as it were “THE STAR OF THE SIRIS, or NILE.” There was also an intermediate stage in the river’s name, in which, by inter-

⁸ Ἡξεις κελαινὸν φῦλον, οἱ πρὸς ἡλίου ναίουσι πηγαῖς, ἔνθα ποταμὸς Αἰθίοψ. τούτου παρ’ ὅχθας ἔρφ’, ἔως ἀν ἐξίκη καταβασμὸν, ἔνθα Βυθλίνων ὄρων ἄπο ἵησι σεπτὸν Νεῖλος εὔποτον ρέος. οὗτος σ’ ὁδώσει τὴν τρίγωνον ἐς χθόνα Νειλῶν.—“Prom. Vinct.” 806.

¹ **Σίρις**, the Nile, so called by the Ethiopians, Dion. 223. So also Jablonski (*Voces Aegyptiae, in Valpy’s Stephanus*), “Siris est Nili nomen antiquissimum, et ut puto origine Aeg. Occurrit apud Dionys. ‘Perieg.’ 223, Plin. v. 5, et Steph. Byz. v. **Σειρῆνη**.”

² Aeschylus, as above cited.

³ Diodor. i. 19, ed. Wesselink, vol. i. p. 22.

change of the aspirated consonants³, it passed from Aithiops to Aiphiops and Aikheops, and thence to Aighyps and Aegyptus⁴; a process of transition traceable in the existing transmutations of the name of the king so called—Aithiops, Aphiops, Phiops, Kheops, Aegyptus. But if the river's ancient name, SIRIS, be not accepted by the learned critics as the true explanation of the derivative name THE SIRIAD, or SIRIADIC LAND, then, at the worst, it might be a corruption by some transcriber. And after all, *it does not occur in the letter*, or in any of the quoted words, but in the general statement made by Syncellus, or the compiler used by him. There are, therefore, other hands to which the error, if error it were, may be attributed, besides the author of the chronology impugned. Surely a forger would not have chosen to create for himself a needless difficulty, by inventing an improbable or unheard-of name for an Egyptian district! And with the fact before us of the manifold transformations through which Oriental proper names have passed in the ancient Greek histories, it seems surprising how any man, having a knowledge of antiquity, could lay stress on such an objection.

2nd. The *κατακλυσμὸς*, or overwhelming in the waters, which is mentioned, may not be the deluge in the days of Noah, but much more likely the overwhelming in the Red Sea; an event of nearer interest, and having more special relation to Egyptian history. The fact of its having been confounded with the deluge of Noah by careless critics, both ancient and

³ See instances of this cited, p. 69 *note*, p. 76. First king of twenty-ninth dynasty.

⁴ Aegyptus was the name of the river as late as in the days of Homer.

modern, is nothing against this. Josephus so confounds it in his mention of the two pillars in the land called “the Siriad⁵; in which he also confounds the antediluvian patriarch Seth with Sethôs, or Sethôsis, that is, Sesostris, by whom the pillars were erected⁶: but the mistake of Josephus is very palpable, and only serves to show that the statement as to these Egyptian pillars or obelisks, and their erection in the Siriadic land, is older than his day. That there was a *κατακλυσμός*, or overwhelming in the waters; that that cataclysm took place in the days of a king SESOSTRIS, whose name, as being sovereign also over Babylon and Assyria, appeared in the Chaldean annals, in the modified forms of Xixuthros⁷, Xisuthros, or Xisithros, and Sisuthros, or Sisithros; and further, that the previous records of the kingdom did not perish thereby, but had been laid up by Sisuthros at Heliopolis, we learn from fragments of information preserved to us from Berosus, by Abydenus, Apollodorus (of Artemita⁸), and Alexander Polyhistor⁹. By these ancient writers, particularly the last, this cataclysm has been confounded, just as by Josephus and by modern learned

⁵ Bishop Stillingfleet justly remarks that Josephus only copies the story of Manetho, “Orig. Sacr.” B. i. ch. 2.

⁶ Ant. i. 2, § 3. The confusion of Seth and Sesostris has been pointed out by Whiston.

⁷ The letter ξ or x is sometimes the equivalent of the Hebrew ψ, as in the names *Xerxes*, *Artaxerxes*, &c. The same Hebrew letter is also represented by Σ or S, as in the rendering of Shishak, Sesac, or Σουσακίη.

⁸ The Apollodorus mentioned quotes Alexander Polyhistor, and therefore could not be Apollodorus of Athens, but might be Apollodorus of Artemita, author of the Parthian history, who is quoted by Strabo.

⁹ Euseb. “Chron.” i. Gr. pp. 4—8, ap. Scalig. “Thesaur. Temp.”

but indiscriminating critics, with the flood of Noah, simply because it was an overwhelming in the waters ; and some facts recorded of Noah have been inserted by Polyhistor, to make out with them more circumstantially the story of Sisuthros, or Sesostris, whose personal history, and the sudden disappearance of Sesostris III., are also mixed up, even more absurdly, with some confused hearsay accounts of the translation of Enoch ! The incongruous mixture arose, no doubt, through the Jews having been settled in large numbers at Babylon and in Chaldea, where their record of the deluge of Noah, and of the earlier patriarchal history thus became known in some imperfect manner to the heathen among whom they dwelt, and was appropriated by the latter in strange confusion with their own tradition of a totally different event. But that Eusebius himself did not understand Sisuthros to be Noah, or the series of kings mentioned before Sisuthros to be allantediluvian, appears from what he expressly says, in the preface to his *Chronicus Canon*, according to Jerome's Latin version, concerning the years before the flood. “ *Item a diluvio usque ad Adam MMCCXLII, in quibus nulla penitus, nec Graeca, nec Barbara, et ut loquar in commune, gentilis reperitur historia* ¹. ” In confirmation of this statement, that neither any Greek nor any other Gentile history of the period before the flood of Noah was in existence, Scaliger adduces, as regards Egypt, a valuable ancient fragment from Cedrenus, which he conjectures to be of Africanus, in which it is affirmed that both the flood of Ogyges and of Deucalion, and still more the general deluge, were unknown to Egyptian history, the two former

¹ Euseb. “ Procœm.” ap. Scalig. “ Thesaur. Temp.” p. 55.

from being only local, the last because it preceded the patriarch Ham, from whom, and subsequently to whom, that history traces its earliest origin². The Hebrew origin of the mixture of the traditions, peers out in the mistake of the meaning of a Hebrew word, by which Heliopolis became removed to Mesopotamia, or to Babylon on the Euphrates. Sisuthros, or Sesostris, had laid up the records at Heliopolis *in the “library,”*—סִפְרִיא *Siphraia*, a Chaldaic plural (or perhaps simply סִפְרִים *Sephārim*, the ordinary plural) from סִפְר *a book*. Alexander Polyhistor, after Berossus, makes it “Heliopolis *in Sippara*,”—ἐν πόλει Ἡλίου Σιππάροις; Abydenus in like manner, ἐν Ἡλίου πόλει τῇ ἐν Σιππάροισι. Bochart, who points out the Hebrew origin and meaning of the word, would identify it with the Sippara (Σιπφάρα) of the Geographer Ptolemy, a town in Mesopotamia³; but the Hebrew for that name, Gesenius⁴ tells us, is probably סִפְרָיִם *Sepharvaim*. Polyhistor evidently had no idea where this mysterious “Sippara” of his could be; but he puts it at Babylon, because the narrative was taken from the accounts of the Chaldeans, and Sisuthrus (Sesostris) was recognized by them as having been sovereign there. So by this account Sippara was at Babylon, and Heliopolis was inside of Sippara(!)—the fact being simply, that the “Sippara,” “Sipharim,” or “Siphraia,” that is, the LIBRARY, or REPOSITORY OF RECORDS, was at Heliopolis, a little south of which stood afterwards the Egyptian town and Chaldean colony of Babylon—*Baboul*, or Old Cairo. The third and greatest Hermes is, as we have seen, expressly referred to the time of Sesos-

² Scalig. “Animadv.” *Ibid.* p. 22.

³ Bochart, *Phaleg.* i. 4.

⁴ Lexicon, *voce* סִפְרָיִם.

tris⁵: and the taste of Sesostris for founding libraries appears from the institution of one in the monument or tomb of Osymandyas at Thebes; for Osymandyas appears beyond a doubt to be the same king with Sesostris the Great. It was not, however, in the reign of that great king that the Egyptian cataclysm, or perishing by water, occurred, nor in the reign and death of his immediate successor, his adopted son, Sesoösis, or Sesostris II., but in the time of the next king, the third Sesostris. Identity of name and title has in some instances caused a confusion of the one with the other. All three were of a dynasty called “Memphian;” but the first was educated in Ethiopia; the second, after the world-wide conquests of his father by adoption, had apparently been made prince of Erech, thus reverting to the old style and title of some of the earliest Egyptian sovereigns. Hence we have the probable explanation of a remarkable passage preserved to us from Apollodorus (not Atheniensis), where, after mentioning several Chaldean kings, he writes as follows: *Εἶτα ἀρξαὶ Ἀμέμψινον* (qu. *Ἀμέμφινον*, equivalent to *τὸν Μεμφίτην?*) *Χαλδαῖον ἐκ Λαράχων, βασιλεύσαι δὲ [σάρον⁶] ιη̄· ἐπὶ δὲ τούτου τὸν μέγαν κατακλυσμόν φησι γεγενῆσθαι*⁷: “Then reigned the Memphian (Amempsinus⁸), a Chaldean of El Erech,” that is, a member of the Sacred Philosophic College of Chaldees there, a

⁵ See “Chron. Pasch.,” cited above, p. 150.

⁶ Qu. substitute *τέρα*?

⁷ Scalig. “Thesaur. Temp.” Gr. p. 5.

⁸ It may be proper also to compare this name with another corruption, *Semempses*, as the word Sesestris, or Sesostris, is written in the first so-called dynasty. The analysis of that corruption will be found in its proper place, particularly in note A. Appendix.

Sophi; “and in his reign he states that the great overwhelming of the waters took place.” In the length of reign given, *Sari* are inserted by the transcriber instead of years; the number is the same with that of the years sometimes assigned to the reign of Sesostris the Great⁹, from whom this narrative does not distinguish his adopted son and grandson of the same name: and there is no reason to doubt that the person alluded to by the name of Amempsinus (or the Memphian) is the same called Xisuthrus, or Sisuthrus, by the Babylonians, for this is marked by what is said of the cataclysm occurring in his reign. Neither is there any reason to doubt that the prince said to be **Χαλδαῖος ἐκ Λαράχων**, “a philosopher, of the Sacred College of the Chaldeans of Erech, or Larakhae,” bears thus the same title, which is also found, with a slight corruption¹, applied to a prince of the Sesostrian dynasty, Larakhēs, that is, Al Arākhēs, the prince of Erech, Orech, or Urchoë. The person in this latter instance might, however, be not the same, though bearing the same title; for, in the list of the Sesostrian princes², it is given apparently to the person under whom, as regent or governor, the labyrinth was built during the reign of Sesostris the Great; and that person seems not to have been the prince who afterwards inherited his throne. But in the Babylonian fragment it may rather apply to the

⁹ As has been pointed out, I, as a numeral mark, is sometimes confounded with Η, and hence ιη' may stand for εη'. See Appendix, Note A.

¹ Λαχάρης, so written for Λαράχης, by a transposition of the two middle consonants.

² See below, in the conspectus of the Manethonian dynasties, Column XII.

second successor of Sesostris the Great, namely, his grandson, natural or adopted, Sesostris the Third, who is there confounded with his father and grandfather, from the identity of the name, and from having been his father's colleague on the throne, while he survived him not quite a year: he is the Pheron of Herodotus. Thus an indirect but important light is thrown on the early part of the Chaldean records, by which we are enabled to extricate from monstrous perversion the first ten reigns so called, or rather stages of their history. I annex a table of them on pages 164, 165, presenting, I hope, this result. And, at the same time, from these fragments of historical statements, reported to us by several ancient authors as having been derived by them from Berosus the Chaldean, a somewhat earlier contemporary of Manetho, we find that there *was* an Egyptian overthrow in the waters, called by these writers the *cataclysmus*, which took place in the time of one of the Sesostrises, who are confounded together as one reign, under the common name of Sisuthrus; but it really occurred in the reign of Sesostris III. We find also that there was a formation and laying up of written records prior to it. It is worthy of remark that Sisuthrus, or Sesostris, in these fragments is placed some time after the Shepherd dynasty at Babylon, which is there represented under the name of Daôs, or Daônus³, the Shepherd; and which, if we can judge from the incomplete list, seems to have held its ground at Babylon for several reigns after it was expelled from

³ If there was originally a guttural breathing, or letter, between the vowels of this name, *Daghôs*, or *Daghôn*, it may in some instances have been silent, in others it may have passed into *g*, “*Dagôn*.”

Egypt. For the mention of it brings it apparently nearer to the reign of Sesostris.

It appears to me then that there is evidence sufficient that the event referred to was not the flood of Noah, and *was* known to Egyptian history; and that it has been as erroneously denied to the latter, as confounded with the former.

3rd. In regard to there having been more than one Egyptian Hermes, a reference to the lists ascribed to Manetho might have satisfied the critics that the name of Thoth, which in Greek is rendered Hermes as the reader knows, is a recurring one in the Egyptian annals, and is presented not unfrequently in combination with other names or titles. We find *Thoth*, “*Athothis*,” or *Thorth*⁴, “*Tosorthros* [*Tothorthos*],” the inventor of stone-cutting and building, and cultivator of letters, who also wrote books on anatomy. Then the Sophi who built the greatest of the pyramids wrote a sacred book. According to my comparative table of the first nineteen Manethonian dynasties, he was Sesokhris the son of *Kneph-Akhthos*; and, either in his minority, subsequent to his father’s assassination, or else earlier during his father’s absence on his expeditions, the government was for a time conducted by one Thoth (or *Teth-Môsis*), who may also have been a son of *Kneph*, as the second Hermes is stated to have been. These

⁴ That there was the letter *r* in a common Egyptian writing of the name Thoth, appears from a statement from Philo Biblius after Sanchoniatho. ‘Απὸ Μισῶρ Τάντος,—δν Αἰγύπτιος μὲν Θωάρ, ‘Αλεξανδρεῖς δὲ Θωάθ, ‘Ελληνες δὲ ‘Ερμῆν ἐκάλεσαν, αρ. Euseb. “Præp. Evang.” i. 10, ed. fol. Colon. 1688, p. 36, A. The Alexandrian spelling of the name thus simply indicates an imperfect articulation of the letter *r*. For if Θωρθ be so pronounced, it will be found to resemble Θωάθ.

THE FIRST CHALDEAN KINGS, ACCORDING TO BEBOSUS.
(Compare Mueller, "Fragm. Hist. Gr.")

FROM ABYDENUS.	FROM APOLLODORUS (probably not Athenensis, but Artemitanus, and later than Alex. Polyhistor, whom he quotes. Vid. Clinton, F. H. vol. iii. p. 557).
A'. Ἀλωρος [Ἀλ-Ὦρος] . . . Σάρους ἶ τὸν δὲ ὑπὲρ ἀώντοι λόγον διαδούνται ὅτι μικροῦ τοῦ λεω ποιμένα δὲ θεός ἀποδείξει.	1. Ἀλωρος.
B'. Νεῖρος ¹ ἔτεα χ'	2. —
Γ'. Σῶσος ¹ [Σεσδωσις, i. e. Σεσδγ- χωσις?] " ξ'	3. —
Δ'. Ἀλάπαρος [omit σάρους] . . . " [γ']	4. Ἀλάπαρος.
Ε'. Ἀμίλλαρος, ἐκ πόλεως Παντι- βίβλου, ἐφ' οὐδενότερος Ἀν- νήδοτος " " [γ']	5. Ἀμηλῶν, ἐκ Παντιβίβλων.
Ϛ'. Ἀμμένων, ἐκ Παντιβίβλων. " [β']	6. Ἀμμένων, δο Χαλδαῖος, ἐφ' οὐδενότερος τὸν μυσταρδὸν οὐάνην τὸν Ἀνηδότον.
Ζ'. Μεγάλανος, ἐκ Παντιβίβλων . . . " [η']	7. Μεγάλαρος, ἐκ Παντιβίβλων πόλεως.
Η'. Δάῶς ποιμῆν, ἐκ Παντιβίβλων, ἐφ' οὐδενότερος γῆν ἐκ θα- λάσσης ἀνέβινσαν " [ι']	8. Δάῶνος ποιμῆν, ἐκ Παντιβίβλων. ἐφ' οὐδενότερος δο.
Θ'. Αεδώραχον Ἀνάδαφος [Ἐνε- δωρέαχον] — μεθ' οὐδενὸν ἄλλοι τε ἡρκαν καὶ	9. Αεδώραχος ἐκ Παντιβίβλων [Ἐνεδώρα- χος]. ἐπι τούτου οὐδάκος [Οὐδάκων].
Ι'. Σίσουθρος ἐπὶ τούτοις — (Compare Euseb. "Praep. Evang." x. 12.) Βασιλεῖς i.	10. Ἀμέμψινος, Χαλδαῖος ἐκ Λαράχων. ἐπι τούτου τὸν μέγαν κατακλυσμὸν φησι γεγενηθεῖαι ² . Βασιλεῖς i.

¹ These two names have most erroneously been taken by some as denominations of periods of time. They are utterly unknown to the ancients in that sense. Hesychius, the Greek lexicographer in the beginning of the third century, knows nothing of any such denominations of time, though he gives the word Σάρος, ἀριθμός τις πάρα Βαβυλονίας. The mistake was first made by Anianus and Panodorus, who were followed in it by Syncellus. The words Σάρος δὲ ἔστι—, Χ. καὶ Γ. ἔτεα, stand in the passage of Abydenus as a *parenthesis*; there having been the intention to explain the word Σάρος, which had just been used. After which the sentence proceeds to the mention of Νεῖρος and Σῶσος. Taking the passage as it is usually construed, the measure or measures apparently given of the Saros, whether viewed as one sum, or as two values of it (600 and 3000 years), are utterly inapplicable and wildly wrong. But the error has without doubt crept in from a marginal memorandum or annotation, Σάρος δὲ εὸτι _____; Χ. καὶ Γ. ἔτεα:—that is, "A saros is _____?" The 600 of the second king, and also No. 3 on the list, are *years*, not *sari*." *The measure of the saros is thus omitted*, having been left blank with a view to be ascertained, but not having been found, and therefore never afterwards filled in. It was easy for an ignorant and senseless transcriber, endued with a taste for the marvellous, to omit the blank for the measure of the saros, convert the comma following the Γ into the mark of thousands at the foot of that letter, and then insert in the text the monstrous result, that a *saros* was 3600 years! I know not whether the monks Anianus and Panodorus were the authors of the corruption; but it was doubtless the more readily embraced by them because it curiously admitted of an apparent explanation on their theory of considering the ancient Chaldean years to have been only days; on which principle 3600 years would be reduced to ten years of 360 days each. Dr. Hales has adopted and set forth this theory ("Chron." vol. iv. 8, 8vo ed.). But see above, p. 138. It is singular that the critics should not have detected the source of the mistake; but the difficulty has been increased to them, as well as by them, in some copies, by the change of the numeral marks into words at length, which is done in Mueller's *Fragments Hist. Gr.*

EUSEB. CHRON. I. GE. P. 5, AP. SCALIG. "THESAUR. TEMP."
vol. iv. p. 280; vol. ii. p. 500.)

PROBABLE SOLUTION.

1. The first man, son of Isis or Nature, Horus, the Apollo or Adam of the human race (comp. above pp. 35, 49, 50), who said of himself that God had constituted him Shepherd of the people, reigned ten sari (centuries).
2. Neiros¹ (quasi Νηρεὺς) οὐρανος, i. e. Noah the HEAD of the race?—at the Flood 600 years old.
3. Sôsus¹, short for Sesoösis or Sesog-Khôsis, that is, "Sheykh of Cush;" in the present instance *Nimrod*, who inherited the patriarchal power or sheykhdom of Cush, and reigned over Babylon sixty years. Others give his reign sixty-two years, as that of Menès. He is here named because he founded the kingdom of Babylon.
- 4.
5. What place or country is called here Pantibiblio? may be open to much doubt; but it suggests to me the land described by Æschylus—
6. Ἐγθα Βυθίλιων δρῶν ἄπο
Ἴησι σεκτὸν Νεῖλος εἴποτον ἦεος.
7. It will be remembered that the Osirian or Assyrian dynasty of Nimrod was also over Egypt, and its glories claimed by the Egyptians, down to the Shepherd dynasty.
8. The Shepherd dynasty at Babylon. Four great invasions from the Persian Gulf occurred during this period, of a piratical or naval description.
- 9.
10. Sesostris:—The overwhelming in the waters.—N.B. In consequence of confounding the cataclysm or overthrow in the Red Sea in the time of Sesostris III. with the Flood of Noah, all the preceding kings have been treated as antediluvian. The accidental concurrence of the number of ten kings has contributed towards this delusion; there having been ten generations of the Patriarchate before the Flood.

² So given by Scaliger, as above cited. In Mueller's "Fragmenta" it agrees more nearly with the καρόνιον next mentioned. The καρόνιον τῶν πρώτων Χαλδαίων βασιλέων, given also by Scaliger, agrees with the list of Apollodorus in leaving out Neiros and Sôsus, but instead of Amempsinus gives the following three, Αμφίς, Οὐάρης, Εἰσούρθος; thus inserting two for the two omitted, to make out the number of ten. But Αμφίς is only another abbreviated writing of Αμέμψινος or Αμέμψινος, "the Memphian" (Αμενόφις). Οὐάρης, Οὐαύρης, or Οὐάρης was a title of the Bactrian kings, and was not improbably assumed by Sesostris or Sisathrus as their conqueror,—equivalent in fact to "King of Bactria." See Ctesias, and Scalig. "Animadv." p. 15. It will be observed that in both the above lists Neiros and Sôsus are necessary to make out the number of ten kings; but in the canonion the last of the ten is divided into three, corresponding to the three Sesostries, under the last of whom (Amenophis, the Chaldean of Erech) the overthrow in the waters occurred. This would make the number twelve. In the preceding lists the three Sesostries had been reckoned as one. On the other hand Adam and Noah might be deducted, as not in the strict sense kings of Babylon, but mentioned in the introduction of their history.

It is evident that these lists do not admit of being summed in their years, because not all the actual generations are specified, but only certain leading landmarks of history;—the first head of the human race; the first patriarchal head of the postdiluvian race; the first founder and head of the Babylonian empire; and so on.

The word *Saros* (ΣΑΡΟΣ, ΣΑΡΑ) among the Chaldeans signified a month, and the moon (Scalig. "Canon. Isagog." lib. iii.), hence a lunar period such as the cycle of eighteen years. On the same principle it might apply to the Egyptian lunar cycle of twenty-five years, or to a multiple of that, as, for instance, by four, which is a century.

preceded the overwhelming of the Egyptian Monarchy in the Red Sea ; as Tat also, the son of the second Hermes and contemporary of Sesostris, must have done. The name Thoth occurs also later. Nay, it survived even in the person of Manetho, or Manethoth, which has been interpreted by Bunsen “Hermodorus.” It is difficult to see with what colour of plausibility the critics could have meant to set off their statement that the Egyptians did not know of two Thoths. If they had them not in *myth*, they had them in history, which is better ; and they had them by the express statements of Plato and of Cicero. But it is remarkable on what slight evidence modern critics often make and accept statements, *provided only they be not supposed even remotely favourable to the truth of Scripture* ; while, if supposed favourable to it, they will sometimes treat some minute objection as completely and decisively fatal. Thus at the root of all their objections to the passage of Manetho which we have been considering, there lies the fact that it contains nothing flagrantly at variance with what a Jew or a Christian might be supposed to accept in regard to the human dynasties of Egypt. Therefore, with a careful array of the most trivial and untenable objections, it is set down by them as the forgery of some Christian Jew ! but a document unfavourable to the truth of Scripture history is easily and eagerly believed ; and the critic will pass over without observation infinitely greater and more palpable objections existing in the barren and contradictory lists of his Egyptian dynasties. Hermetic books constitute a fatal objection in his eyes, if quoted in illustration of the Manethonian Canicular scheme by the writer who furnished the extract, but none at all when referred to in the

alleged Manethonian dynasties, transmitted under the name of Africanus, where they are affirmed to be extant, and are made some three thousand years older! treating of anatomy, and ascribed to the inventor of stone-cutting and writing⁵. He critically strains out the gnat from his liquor, but manfully and even eagerly swallows the camel, with a stolid contempt for consistency and still more for those who would weigh the trustworthiness of the Scripture record against the vast assumed antiquity of the early Egyptian kings. The slight circumstance that in other ancient mentions of the works of Manetho there is not specified under that name the book of Sothis, is made a grave objection; as if that title might not designate a particular part, say the first of the “three volumes,” of a larger work of history and chronology, setting out with reference to the Sothic Cycle, and applying it as the basis of the theoretical arrangement, more particularly of the kingdom of the gods. But I may be permitted to give one illustration of the facility with which such men allow the most worthless evidence when it makes against Scripture. We have seen above that they prefer the list of the dynasties which comes to us under the name of Africanus, and not according to the original copy of his work but according to a rewritten and interpolated edition⁶, to that other copy of the dynasties which, where it differs, they allege, with reckless accusation of one of the most learned and most respectable of the fathers, to have been corrupted by Eusebius, a slander in which Syncellus

⁵ See above, pp. 104—107, and compare below, Chap. VI., latter part.

⁶ Κατὰ τὴν δευτέραν ἔκδοσιν Ἀφρικανοῦ. See this remarked upon below, p. 173, *note*.

led the way. Now in the Manethonian list attributed to Africanus, in the fourth dynasty, there occur these words, following the mention of SUPHIS: "He was arrogant toward the gods, and wrote a sacred book, which I acquired as a great treasure when I was in Egypt." And this then is their *Manetho*, native Egyptian, and high priest! this *transient* visitor in Egypt! this travelling collector of old curiosities! We know not who he was, but certainly not *Manetho*. Probably the fact here apparent that he had once been in Africa gave rise to his being called *Africanus*; but whether *Julius* or not, is quite another question. Still less, then, do we know on whose summation of these alleged Manethonian dynasties it is, that the ages of the monuments of Egypt are now numbered and catalogued in the world's museums! If the words quoted be not *Manetho*'s, where is the proof that the numeration or summation is *Manetho*'s? The lists as separate documents might be of genuine antiquity and might have been brought from Africa by an honest man; and yet their putting together and summation may be an utter fabrication. If the lists should be supposed to have been collected by *Julius Africanus*, or some other earlier antiquarian, we only know that the putting together and summation of them as successive dynasties cannot be attributed to him or to *Eusebius*. They are indeed not one series, but gathered from different Greek sources of different ages, having traces of different modes of spelling, and of different writing of the Greek characters. But faith is claimed for the unknown antiquarian purveyor of these old dislocated documents, the extoller of his magnificent purchase in the acquisition of a book written by a king of the fourth (so called) dynasty! Faith is

claimed also for the person who put the dynasties together, and whose summation of them makes this veritable manuscript to have been 4483 years old at the date of Alexander the Great⁷! and therefore so much older when purchased, as the date of the antiquarian collector was later! and his word passes with learned Egyptian votaries against the sacred records of the word of God, even as if it had been the word of MANETHO himself! The moderate and historical antiquity of the books of Moses *exceeds* their belief; but this not at all! German criticism with elastic throat gulps down the monster, and makes no mouths about it. This is to be accepted as Manetho's; and the other is not! With matchless learning and assiduity they spend their efforts to illustrate the fabricated, and to set aside the genuine; to put down the truth, and to set up the lie!

Bunsen clinches the matter with his magisterial dictum, calling the more genuine “those valueless impostures⁸.” But as he does not condescend to produce any thing in support of this *ipse dixit*, beyond his own mis-translation⁹, and the indorsing of one

⁷ The summation of the dynasties of the list attributed to Africanus amounts to 5354 years, terminating at Alexander the Great. The summation of the dynasties prior to the date of the royal author of the manuscript in question, and including his whole reign, amounts only to 871 years. The interval, therefore, was 4483 years from the author of the book to Alexander! And if this be not enough, there is another still more ancient book which is declared to be extant, written by the second king of the first dynasty.

⁸ “Egypt's Place in Universal History,” vol. i. p. 8, and p. 233.

⁹ Ibid. p. 212. Professing to translate from Syncellus, he states that that writer says, “Manetho, the high priest of the Egyptian idols, wrote a fabulous work on the dog-star.” The word “fabulous” is interpolated. He renders Σεβαστῷ “semper Augustus,” which conveys an unwarranted impression; and

or two of the feeble objections which have been cited and answered above, we may assume that the sweeping condemnation is only one of his “universal formulæ :” like the “lever applicable to universal history,” or the “universal formula for the relation which a colonial language bears, on the one side, to the tongue of the mother country, and on the other to the modern idioms which there may have entirely superseded it;” or that by which “the laws of language in the ante-historical ages are defined :” objects of his confident research, which may be classed with that sublime generalization of mediæval alchemy the philosopher’s stone. But alas! it would require a more powerful alchemy than was even then imagined, to transmute into sense the sublime and presumptuous grandiloquence of his final conclusion, when he talks about his constructing and delineating the curve described by the Divine mind in man through space and time upon this star which we call the earth¹.

This only may be said in extenuation, that they

he makes the letter addressed to Philadelphus speak of “*your ancestor* Hermes Trismegistus,” giving the meaning, *Ptolemy’s ancestor*, instead of *Manetho’s*, as it is. Again, p. 214, he translates, “The Egyptians,” says Syncellus, “BOAST of a certain old chronicle by which also, in my opinion, Manetho” (the impostor) “was led astray.” There is no word for “BOAST,” though he prints it large, but simply φέρεται, *there is extant*, or *there is handed down*, or *in circulation*, “in manibus hominum versatur;” and Syncellus does not say that Manetho was led astray by it, but that he had strayed from it, not ὥφ’ οὖ, but ἐξ οὖ, only starting from it; as he says elsewhere, ἐκ τούτων δηλαδή λαβὼν τὰς ἀφορμὰς, κατὰ πολὺ διαφωνεῖ, &c. In ordinary free translation these might be instances of carelessness; but in construing a document which is the subject of reasoning, they are graver departures from the accuracy of truth.

¹ Ibid. pref. pp. ix, x, xi, and vol. v. p. 105.

had been unlucky enough to choose the more corrupted form of the document as preserved in our present editions of Syncellus for the ground of their criticism, instead of the considerably purer copy of it obtained and preserved for us by Scaliger in his Greek *Sozomena* of *Eusebius's Chronica*. Syncellus's copy, as we have it in the editions, is so much more corrupted, as to render the perfect recovery of the original Sothic scheme of the chronology extremely difficult, if that had been our only source. But Scaliger's copy had long been before the world, and it does not raise our estimation of their critical acumen that they have preferred the worse. At the same time they have constructed their own theories for the restoration of *Manetho* on conjecture. Thus Bœckh, who is followed by many, and is in high repute, though his cyclical arrangement is rejected by Bunsen, has built his theoretical reconstruction on the baseless assumption that a Canicular Cycle began with Menês²: a purely gratuitous and con-

* Vid. Mulleri “*Fragm. Hist. Gr.*” ii. 518, 519. 600. I may be permitted to quote a few words from Mueller for the reader's satisfaction.

“Quærendum igitur adminiculum, cui inniti, vel norma quædam, ad quam dirigere computationes possimus. Circumspicienti vero ejusmodi machinam sponte sese offert periodus Sothiaca. Usum eo esse veteris chronici auctorem constat,” &c.

“Igitur Menæ initium, apud *Manethonem Syncelli*, compositum fuerat cum initio periodi canicularis,” &c. [There is no ground for this inference. The true force of a passage, which is quoted from Syncellus, we have shown elsewhere.] “Nullus ego dubito” (he adds) “quin hæc quam Bœckhius exposuit chronologiæ adornatio latuerit in ea *Manethonis* recensione, quam Africanus, si non in singulis quibusque tamen in plurimis certe expressit,” &c.

There is subjoined by Mueller this damaging confession, “Patet vero illud cycli initium, non esse astronomicum.”

jectural assumption, by which history as well as astronomy is directly falsified, as we shall find when we come, in Chapter X., to the consideration of that part of the subject.

Finally there are two circumstances of such weight and importance in confirmation of the genuineness of the Manethonian canicular scheme of the Egyptian Chronology which we have been examining, that even if we had not already answered every objection produced they might be considered decisive. The first of these, which though mentioned in a preceding chapter must not here be omitted, as forming an important point in this argument, and which we shall strengthen for that purpose by a confession of Dr. Lepsius, is that Eusebius in his own work is ignorant of the existence of any human dynasty of Manetho's before the fifteenth and sixteenth. It is *not* that, as an opponent of an antisciptural chronology, he *rejects* fourteen dynasties. Not so: he had simply never heard of them; he never once alludes to them, even to object. He knew the works of Manetho; but the scheme of thirty human dynasties was not there, or else he must have known and mentioned them either to sanction or to object. They were not therefore so early in existence; and consequently the presumption is that neither were they known to the still earlier Julius Africanus, with whose works Eusebius was familiar: but they have been fabricated at a later period out of Manetho's materials, and put with the works of these two writers. Lepsius himself, with a happy blindness to the legitimate consequence of his admission, frankly confesses that they were even unknown to Josephus in the first century of our era, and unknown to Theophilus of Antioch in the second century. “The

complete dynastic lists of the Manethonic work,” says he, “which by a different method have themselves been preserved, seem to have been unknown to both. These were first preserved to us by Africanus in the third century³.” No, as far as regards Africanus, they were first preserved to us by Syncellus in the ninth century, and are falsely ascribed to Julius Africanus. Syncellus is their earliest authority. “THROUGH HIM ALONE,” writes Dr. Lepsius, “WE POSSESS ESPECIALLY THE MOST VALUABLE BASIS FOR OUR MANETHONIC CHRONOLOGY, THE DYNASTIC LISTS OF AFRICANUS.” O truly “valuable,” this “grand bargain” of the travelling collector of old curiosities, by which a fabricated lie of three thousand years is set up for the contradicting of the Holy Scriptures! this noble basis of the irrefragable discoveries of Dr. Lepsius and the subsequent Egyptologists! this later appendage to the work of the long defunct Africanus, republished *κατὰ τὴν δευτέραν ἔκδοσιν*⁴, with the alterations, additions, and interpolations of others!

The other circumstance is that Eusebius, or an ancient authority considered with reason to be he, incidentally states that the sixteenth dynasty was included in the past Canicular Cycle according to Manetho⁵. This allusion to the Sothic Cycle, wholly

³ Lepsius, “Egypt, Ethiopia, and Sinai,” Engl. Transl., Bohn, pp. 497, 498.

⁴ It is so cited by Syncellus;—*κατὰ τὴν δευτέραν ἔκδοσιν Ἀφρικανοῦ*, “Chronogr.” ed. Goar. fol. p. 56, ed. Dindorf. vol. i. p. 104. Goarus has a note on it, remarking that *δευτέραν* is redundant, and must be incorrect if it alluded to one of the two *ἔκδόσεις* of the dynasties mentioned by him. But it does not apply to these, but to Africanus. That the original *ἔκδοσις* or edition of “Africanus” did not contain them may be known from the “Excerpta Barbara.”

⁵ The passage is cited from Syncellus above, p. 144, note. It

incidental and undesigned as regards the present question, can only be explained by reference to the general scheme of the Manethonian Chronology which we have been considering ; and with that it is in full agreement. It shows that the scheme was accepted as Manetho's by Eusebius, and by the ancient authorities from whom he took the list of Egyptian kings in which it occurs ; and that there was no Manethonian scheme known to them at variance with it. We shall examine the alleged dynasties by and by, and elicit their own testimony ; which will be found, as far as it goes, confirmatory of the Manethonian scheme above examined, and at variance with the fabricated chronology which has been based upon their numeration and summing by some nameless and unknown men, who, with Manetho's or other ancient materials before them, have so used them as to show themselves not more distinguished by a heathen zeal to exalt against Scripture the antiquity of Egypt, than by pitiable blundering and incompetence, and flagrant injustice to the heathen high priest whose works they were handling.

is given by Scaliger as part of the Greek Sozomena of the first book of Eusebius's Chronica, in his "Thesaur. Temp." p. 21. The critics have failed in their attempts to destroy or evade the plain meaning of it.

CHAPTER VI.

THE PROGRESSIVE CORRUPTION OF THE MANETHONIAN CHRONOLOGY TRACED.

THE process of corruption of the Manethonian chronology admits, to some extent, of being traced and accounted for, as we have already in part indicated. Some additional particulars it may be useful to subjoin for the fuller confirmation of the truth, and exposure of the error.

I have pointed out that the numeral mark, which in the extract from Manetho is employed to denote a myriad, is one which is also found employed to denote 900. A mistake and interpolation have resulted from this in the passage as presented to us in Syncellus. First, γ , $\overline{\gamma}$, ω $\bar{\delta}$ (33,804) has, by throwing out the second γ , reading $\overline{\gamma}$ 900, and ω as π , been rendered $\gamma\pi\omega\delta'$ (3984); and then, there being thus created a manifest deficiency of three myriads, a clause has been interpolated—"Sol the son of Vulcan reigned three myriads of years!" I do not

¹ Ἡφαίστου χρόνος οὐκ ἔστι, διὰ τὸ νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας αὐτὸν φαίνειν. [Ἡλιος Ἡφαίστου ἐβασίλευσεν ἑτῶ μυριάδας τρεῖς.] ἔπειτα, Κρόνος, φησὶ, καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ πάντες θεοὶ δώδεκα ἐβασίλευσαν ἔτη γεωδύ, &c. Where the three myriads are mentioned lower in the passage, as given by Syncellus, the notation there em-

accuse Syncellus as the author of this interpolation : yet from the introduction of the word *φησι*, *not in this* but in the *next* clause, it may seem that he was sensible he ought to limit the strict *quotation of Manetho* to the part which follows, excluding these interpolated words from being Manetho's, though, as he or his transcriber may have imagined, necessary to make out the time.

In the next place, the erroneous numbering of the two dynasties just following those fifteen generations which were allowed for the completion of the Canicular Cycle, where they are called the sixteenth and seventeenth, instead of the seventeenth and eighteenth respectively, created an apparent omission of a dynasty, as we have already pointed out when rectifying the numeration. To remedy this apparent omission, a dynasty of four generations of Memphites has been interpolated between the two, and 103 years assigned to it², which puts the numbers still further wrong. But the dynasty which we numbered the eighteenth stands there as the eighteenth ; showing that, at the time of the interpolation, the error had been confined to the numbering of the seventeenth dynasty as the sixteenth ; and of that mistake there may be a probable cause, in its following the fifteen generations. There is proof that Manetho was understood to have reckoned these fifteen generations as equivalent to two dynasties, the fifteenth and sixteenth ; for Eusebius, as already cited, expressly states that the sixteenth dynasty employed in Dindorf's edition is *Μγ* (Syncel. "Chronogr." ed. Dindorf, pp. 72, 73), but in the passage as given by Scaliger, it is *Μγ* ; and the same mark, there answering to the *M*, has been read in the rest of the fragment as *ȝ*, which has also that form.

² See above, p. 116, *note*, and p. 120.

was included with the 443 years within the past Canicular Cycle³.

That the enumeration of the dynasties which we have given was the true one, and that Manetho did not count thirty or thirty-one *human* dynasties, but only sixteen, may be confirmed from the Barbarous-Latin extracts, where they are given as follows :

(*The numeration and classification of the dynasties in the first and last columns are prefixed and added by me.*)

I.	1. Mineus and seven	253 years.	[15th and 16th dynasty.]
	2. descendants . . .		
	3. Other eight . . .		
II.	3. Necheracheus and other eight . . .	214 , ,	[17th dynasty.]
	4. Other seventeen . . .	214 , ,	[18th , ,]
	5. Other twenty-one . . .	258 , ,	[19th , ,]
	6. Othoi and other seven . . .	203 , ,	[20th , ,]
	7. Fourteen others . . .	140 , ,	[21st , ,]
	8. Other twenty . . .	409 , ,	[22nd , ,]
	9. Other seven ⁴ . . .	204 , ,	[23rd , ,]
	10. Dynasty of Diospolitans	9 , ,	[24th , ,]
	11. , , Bubastians . . .	153 , ,	[25th , ,]
III.	12. , , Tanites . . .	184 , ,	[26th , ,]
	13. , , Sebennites . . .	224 , ,	[27th , ,]
	14. , , Memphites . . .	318 , ,	[28th , ,]
	15. , , Heliopolitans . . .	221 , ,	[29th , ,]
	16. , , Hermopolitans	258 , ,	[30th , ,]

³ Above, pp. 142—144, note.

⁴ We cannot depend upon these successions being put down in their exact historical order. The compiler's object being simply to obtain the sum, he may have put them down in the readiest order, just as he lighted on the mention of them in the pages of a somewhat discursive historical treatise or survey of Manetho's, written not in the manner of annals, but on a method of its own, as we may conclude from what we find in the treatment of the history by Diodorus. "Necherocheus and other eight" probably ought to be placed not *after* the first fifteen generations, but nearer the beginning of that first period; and all the successors, on to

It is clear that the statement here is adapted to a numerical reckoning of the human dynasties by Manetho, as only sixteen out of the thirty ; the first fourteen being occupied by gods and semi-divine kings. The writer then indicates the whole number of the human dynasties to be included by the words, “These are the dynasties of the Egyptians” (Hæc sunt Potestates Ægyptiorum), and he informs us that Manetho gave the sum total of the years, counting from his own time back as far as the seventeenth dynasty (inclusive) as amounting to one thousand five hundred and twenty⁵. Of the whole enumeration it will be observed, there are only sixteen *human* dynasties, the last of which is counted the thirtieth from the commencement of the divine, and therefore the reckoning to the *seventeenth* must necessarily be taken backward from the thirtieth upwards, by which the seventeenth is the third in the descending order of human dynasties as above.

But an examination of the numbers of the years contained in this writer's account will at once show that he has joined together in an incongruous manner statements from different portions of Manetho's work ; and, though he has given the correct number of human dynasties sixteen, he has made them out in detail not as Manetho intended, nor in a manner which gives Manetho's sum total of the years. A careful inspection of his statement, according to the three divisions in which I have

“Othðes and other seven,” ought in like manner to be earlier by the space of those fifteen generations. That space of time is to be allowed for afterwards in the general sum of the years down to Alexander. The proof of this depends on facts and principles which appear in the course of this work.

⁵ See above, p. 119.

bracketed it on the left side, will I think enable the reader to satisfy himself of the following facts.

I. The two first in the descending order of the dynasties, having together fifteen descendants of Menes, are the fifteen generations to whom 443 years are assigned. The number given here, however, comes to 555, which is the sum given to the first and second dynasties in the corrupted version of them, transmitted by the interpolator of Eusebius, and also in the list under the name of "Africarus's second edition."

II. The numbers following these, from the third to the ninth inclusive, in the descending order, are not named as *dynasties* from any city or national denomination, but are a simple succession, *irrespective* of local distinctions.

III. The numbers following from the tenth to the sixteenth, in the descending order, are, on the contrary, all named by city or national dynasty, and not by succession. All the Diospolitans are put together, and so of the others. There is no intermingling or recurrence of dynasties of the same city.

We have, therefore, here two distinct modes of enumeration, one by descent in lineal succession, the other by classification according to city or other local dynastic designation. These are collateral methods of statement, and they ought not to be added to one another, with a view to obtaining the sum, which in that case would inevitably be double of the truth; just as the muskets of a regiment would be, if first counted in long file, and then as marshalled by companies. Let us place them side by side, excluding, for the reason above given, the first fifteen generations from Mineus, or Menes, and commencing with the seventeenth dynasty, to which

Necherocheus is here erroneously assigned⁶; but that will not affect the present point or the numbers in the present argument.

Necherocheus and other eight.	214	Dynasty of Diospolitans [9]	149 ⁷
Other seventeen . . .	214	Bubastians . .	153
Other twenty-one . . .	258	Tanites . .	184
Othoi and other seven . . .	203	Sebennites . .	224
Fourteen others . . .	140	Memphites . .	318
Other twenty. . .	409	Heliopolitans . .	221
Other seven . . .	204	Hermopolitans . .	258
Sum . . .	<u>1642</u>	Sum . . .	<u>1507</u>
		Add Persian Dynasty .	135
			<u>1642</u>

Now allowing, as Diodorus instructs us, somewhat less than thirty-six years of this period for the four Ethiopian reigns, by the intervening of which it was to that extent prolonged, the remainder of this number of years, somewhat under 1607, divided by thirty years for a generation, will give $53\frac{1}{2}$ generations. And if fifty-two of these Thirty-year Periods were assumed to have terminated at the date of Alexander's overthrowing the Persian empire, B.C. 330, then the remainder, which is a generation and half, or in round numbers forty-five years, brings us to the year of the accession of Ptolemy Philadelphus to the throne, by association with his father⁸, B.C. 285. As Manetho not only wrote in that reign, but by command of that king, and dedicated his work to Philadelphus, this circumstance cannot be held irrelevant. That interval of forty-five years from Alexander to Philadelphus is just the difference between the

⁶ See above, *note*, p. 177.

⁷ The number in the text is only 9; but as it is evident that the larger portion of the original number has been dropped by mistake, I have ventured conjecturally to restore 140 years to it.

⁸ Clinton, "Fasti Hellen." vol. ii. p. 162.

former sum of the dynasties from the beginning of the seventeenth to the close of the thirtieth (which we found in Manetho's general scheme or programme of the chronology to be 1597 years, or 1596 complete⁹), and the sum *now* found on analysis of this Barbarous-Latin extract, which begins the reckoning at the same point, but extends it to 1642 years. There can be no reason to doubt that Manetho's work afforded ground for both of these manners of statement, by computing in one place down to Alexander, and in another adding the measure down to Philadelphus, in another to the date of his own writing; while in another still he may have thrown out the years of the duration of the Persian conquest, thus limiting his calculation to the reigns of the native kings, in the manner of Diodorus.

By our analysis of this Barbarous-Latin extract, we have obtained, besides confirmation of previous conclusions, one or two special results.

First, it appears that Manetho's work did contain, with other things, that statement of the chronology not by local dynasties, but by native successions, irrespective of dynasty, of which Diodorus has preserved to us a more detailed account. And it appears from a statement in the same place, of the *Excerpta Barbara*, that the second volume of Manetho presented the subject thus.

Secondly, it plainly appears that the measure of fifty-two successions of generations, taken as Thirty-year Periods, would only span the time back to the beginning of the seventeenth dynasty in Manetho's general chronological scheme. But agreeably to what has been observed even from Diodorus himself¹, there were probably some more generations,

⁹ See above, p. 118.

¹ See above, pp. 72, 78.

either between Menès and the beginning of those fifty-two, or in some other place, to be inserted and added to the span of time from Menès to Alexander the Great. The reason of the separate reckoning of these very plainly appears from Manetho's general scheme; and they amount in round numbers to fifteen generations additional, or more exactly to 443 years.

Diodorus, we may here be allowed parenthetically to observe, at first seems to state the succession of the fifty-two as following directly after Menès. Yet, when he afterwards enters on the details of the succession without being conscious that it is the same, he expresses himself with some vagueness, and has left it somewhat ambiguous whether there were eight to be counted at the beginning of the series before those whom we have numbered, and afterwards a parenthesis of ages to be inserted in the midst of the currency of the series, corresponding to the *remainder* of the fifteen; or whether, in his enumeration of the successions, the nine first mentioned are not rather the same which are referred to by him over again, only with a vague inaccuracy in his manner of statement, or a cloudy misconception of his information. Tested by Manetho, it will be found that, in reckoning the native successions as fifty-two, Diodorus left out of view the fifteen generations separately mentioned by Manetho; that that writer certainly began the fifty-two from Menès; that the first fifteen of the fifty-two consequently are concurrent with the fifteen generations separately allotted by Manetho for filling up the past Canicular Cycle; that Diodorus became further confused in the order of the successions, in consequence, probably, of some recurring mention by Manetho of the builders

of the pyramids ; that consequently he found a wide gap in the succession, and an abrupt interval of ages ; that to supply that gap it is necessary for us to allow an equivalent for the fifteen generations, which he had overlooked in stating the native succession at only fifty-two ; but that down to Sesoösis II. the numbers run correctly, and that king is to be counted the thirty-first in the succession of generations from Menês. In stating this, we have slightly anticipated ; but it will be found to be for the convenience of the reader.

Thirdly, these fifteen generations have been taken in part as constituting the basis of the first and second of the fabricated Manethonian dynasties, transmitted to us under the false names of Africanus and Eusebius ; but there being a deficiency of *names*, these, except one or two, were filled up from the period of the eighteenth dynasty, as will afterwards be found. The number of years assigned to them in these lists is the same which we find in this Barbarous-Latin extract. But in Manetho's general scheme, as presented in the passage which we have examined, the two first human dynasties are not numbered as the *first* and *second* dynasty, but the *fifteenth* and *sixteenth*.

Fourthly, the first sources of the confusion and corruption of the Manethonian chronology by subsequent writers are distinctly traceable. There existed in his work two *parallel* computations, the first lineal, by the succession of monarchs and of measured generations ; the second ethnical, or civic, being a classification according to cities, provinces, or races. We have found proof that the one of these two parallel computations was by his unskilful readers actually added to the other ! The periods

of duration were thus doubled at once ; and the long mythical periods with which Manetho had set out, seemed to cover the absurdity of supposing that enormous, but yet in comparison far minor, extension of time. The next cause was the substitution of the Julian for the Egyptian year, by which the Canicular Cycle was put aside, and the immense periods of the gods, which he had constructed upon it, were deprived of their only intelligible basis. Thus the first thirteen dynasties fell to the ground, and with them the fourteenth was confounded, and so lost sight of. Only the human remained of any interest. But as it was well known that there had been thirty dynasties, or even, including Vulcan, thirty-one, the dunces of the day set to work to count out thirty *human* dynasties, where there never were but sixteen: and they left out at the same time the semi-divine dynasty, though that was in truth historic and patriarchal. Alas, for poor Manetho and his chronology ! Was ever intellectual carcase so run away with by maggots ? Surveying the miserable spectacle of drivelling, and vermicular-spinning of false chronology, falsely imputed to Manetho, we could hardly help wondering that Eusebius thought it worthy of transmission, if we had not proof from Eusebius himself that he is guiltless of having done so. What we find in Eusebius is not a rejection of the first fourteen reputed dynasties of Manetho, but an ignorance of their existence. He, or an ancient writer taken by Scaliger with much probability to be he, speaks of the sixteenth dynasty as being included in the past Canicular Cycle, conveying a manifest allusion to its being included in the 443 years assigned for the completion of that cycle, as we found where he

mentions Konkharis. The same ignorance of their existence is shown by the author of the Barbarous-Latin extracts, who, with the works of Eusebius, Africanus, Castor, and others before him, found only mention of sixteen human dynasties, that is from the fifteenth to the thirtieth inclusive. The writer of these extracts appears to have lived in the reign of Theodosius the Great, for he carries his chronology only down to the birth of Honorius. Theodosius died A.D. 395. Even with the clue which we have obtained, it may be doubtful whether the chronological fabrication of the dynasties admits of being completely unravelled, and still more whether it is worth the pains.

The first grand step in the extension of the time allotted to the human dynasties of Manetho, we have found to be the placing of his two parallel computations in one column and summing them together. This, without allowance for the Persian dynasty, swelled the 1642 years, as reckoned from the beginning of the seventeenth dynasty to Alexander the Great, at one sweep, to 3149; and, adding to these the years of the fifteenth and sixteenth dynasties, 443 for fifteen successors of Menes, besides sixty-two years for Menes himself (together 505²), we come thus to the sum of 3654 years, pretty well for a beginning. Then, as this is only for sixteen out

² This may be the source of the computed number. The Pseudo-Africanus makes it 555; the Pseudo-Eusebius's figures would give only 514. The last number would result, if the fifteen generations were taken at their full measure of thirty years each (together 450 years), and the reign of Menes at sixty-four years. We have found that there is a defect of at least fifty years somewhere in Manetho's Chronology. If this was observed anciently it may have been allowed for in the former number.

of thirty dynasties, there was ample scope for further enlargement of the imaginary duration. They have accordingly extended the sum total to 5354 years, which is exactly equivalent to making a rough allowance of 1700 years for the fourteen missing dynasties.

But why have we not, in this rough allowance, a correspondence, in the number of centuries, with the number of dynasties to be supplied? If my reader will have patience to accompany me a moment, this will be found to be the result of another transparent blunder of theirs. The *seventeenth* dynasty in the general scheme of Manetho is the first human dynasty *clearly numbered by itself*; the two preceding having been taken together with the semi-divine kings and a small part of the period of the divine, to round off the twenty-fourth Canicular Cycle³: and if Vulcan's reign be reckoned a dynasty⁴, then that would make this seventeenth dynasty the *eighteenth*. When, therefore, the full twenty-fourth Canicular Cycle was swept away with the gods and demigods, some of those ancient dunces, who are the oracles of so many modern Egyptologists, thought they had *seventeen* dynasties to supply, and did it at the rate of a round century to each. Where years were so easily coined, we may be satisfied with their moderation; but then, to recommend that moderation, there was the difficulty of making out

³ See pp. 101—103.

⁴ No measured time is assigned by Manetho to Vulcan; but this was overlooked by the corrupters of the Manethonian Chronology, as is evident from many proofs, among others from the "Barbarous-Latin Extracts," and from the circumstance that some counted the Manethonian dynasties thirty-one, as witness the pseudo-Africanus.

the fictitious dynasties in detail, with names of historic persons, a difficulty which might be considerable. Let us see how they have acquitted themselves in this, premising first one or two general observations.

From Diodorus we find the probability that the title of *Bousiris*, Bausiris, or Ba' Osir⁵ (Lord of Ashur), belonged to at least the eight earliest successors of Menès, first and last⁶; and that the eighth and perhaps the fifteenth, if not also the whole preceding and intermediate part of the series, had also the additional title of Urkhoæus, or Erékhovi, that is, "of Erech," or equivalent to "Prince of Erech;" from the city Erech, *Ὀρέχ*, Orchoë, or Urchoa, founded by Nimrod. No other special or personal names are mentioned by Diodorus as pertaining to this period. These titles descended, as did afterwards the royal designation "Pharaoh." The same monarch who ruled Egypt at the first, ruled also more extensive dominions in Asia; and though the pride of race and clanship led the Egyptians to claim, as specially their own, the reigning Sheykh of Cush, or descendant of Ham, who ruled those extensive territories, and to glory in their kinsman's subjugation of the Assyrians as a conquest made by the king of Egypt, yet from another point of view, it must have had the effect

⁵ This slurring or omission of the *l* in Baal may be illustrated from Lepsius, by the dropping of the same letter in the conversion of Melek (king) into Mak.—"Egypt, Ethiopia, and Sinai," p. 182 (Bohn, 1853). Bunsen tells us that in the Coptic and Old Egyptian, *l* is expressed by the same letter with *r*, between which it had a medial sound, apt above all consonants, in the popular dialect, to be dropped at the end of a word.—"Egypt's Place," &c. vol. i. pp. 452, 449, 273.

⁶ Diodor. i. 45, 50, cited above, p. 72.

of rendering their country only one satrapy of his wide empire. The kings of Egypt, from hereditary pretension, continued to claim the title of Osir, or Lord of Ashur, from Nimrod, long after it had ceased to represent any real dominion, just as in England the title of king of France was long borne upon the coins of our sovereigns, without representing any actual power. Probably this continued in Egypt after the very meaning and origin of the title were lost sight of; until a more distinctly national character was assumed, and the dominion of the Osirites (ASSYRITES, ATHYRITES, or, dropping the gradually attenuated consonant, AÝRITES) was subverted and succeeded by a dynasty of the Allophylite MESTRAEANS, a branch of the race of Mizraim; who also assumed, but failed to retain distinctively, the Osirian title, together with that of Pharaoh. This change seems to have taken place as a consequence of the conquest of Egypt by the Shepherds, and consequently indicates them to have been, like the Philistines, descendants of Mizraim. After the expulsion of the Mizraite Shepherds, the name of EGYPTIAN became applied to the new conquering dynasty, and to the country which they recovered. It takes its origin from one of the greatest of their monarchs. These three successive races of sovereigns, together with the two preceding classes, namely the gods and the semi-divine kings, appear to have constituted "the five races of Egyptian kings, of which Manetho spoke, in thirty dynasties; consisting of those called by them gods, semi-divine kings and deceased men, and mortals," as Syncellus informs us⁷. But the removal of the gods and

⁷ Ed. Dindorf, vol. i. pp. 73 and 97. See above, p. 128, and note there.

semi-divine kings left only the three successive races of the mortal kings above mentioned.

Let us now take a few illustrations of the manner in which the pseudo-Manethonian succession of dynasties has been fabricated, with the help doubtless of a few royal tablets, and other family lists, which Manetho may have brought together among his authorities.

1. The second king of the third dynasty, of the list ascribed to Africanus, is called Tosorthros. He is said to be reckoned the Egyptian *Æsculapius*⁸, in regard to the healing art; and he invented building with hewn stone, and invented or cultivated the art of writing. Dropping then the initial consonant or syllable of his name, and pronouncing the *s* with a lisp, it is, with little more variation, made into Athothis, or Thoth, and appears as the name of a new king, the second of the first dynasty, the immediate successor of Menès; who is said to have built the palace in Memphis (surely not before the invention of building with hewn stone), and to have written books still extant on anatomy, for he was a physician⁹; but this surely not before the invention of writing, nor before the Egyptian *Æsculapius*. Here then is one and the same man Thorth¹, or

⁸ Jablonski explains Τόσορθος to mean the same with *Æsculapius*, *Tuse-tho*, “qui totam terram curat.” “Panth. Egypt.” lib. v. cap. 6, § 4, p. 195; but he adds, “Hinc factum esse videtur ut Egyptiorum Vetustus *ÆSCULAPIUS*, cum eorundem ΤΗΘΗ, vel Mercurio, nonnunquam *UNUS IDEMQUE* existimaretur.” We may venture to analyze the name rather more in conformity with this fact.

⁹ Οὗ φέρονται βίβλοι ἀνατομικαὶ, ἱατρὸς γὰρ ἦν. Hence, no doubt, the ascription of certain books on *Materia Medica* to Hermes.

¹ That an *r* sometimes had place in the spelling of Thoth, Θωῶρ (Θῶρθ), or Θωὺθ, see above, p. 163, note.

Thoth, made into two. The prefixed syllable *To* or *Ta* signifies *place*, as we have it in the isle Ta-khompso, the place of Khampsai, or crocodiles ; Tapanhès, the place of Pakhnas ; so Ta-Thorth, strictly Hermopolis, the place or princedom put for the man. Or else the prefix may be a Barbarous-Greek article: compare *Taxέρης* (ο *Xέρης*, or *Xaiρης*?).

2. The ninth king of the fourth dynasty is Sesô-khris, and he is put in after the number of kings of that dynasty had been reckoned up as only *eight* ; but they are summed again, with him included. Sesokhris is there said to have been five cubits and three palms in height, and nine (palms) in breadth. This brings him into comparison, if not identity, with Sesostris the third king of the twelfth dynasty, of whom the list ascribed to Eusebius gives this more easily credible, though still gigantic, measurement, that he is said to have been four cubits, three palms, and two fingers in height ; a little over seven feet. This we may take as the more correct reading, which in process of corruption has first been roughly put at five cubits (a little in excess of the whole measure), and then, to make it more *accurate*, some one has added the fractional parts, but forgotten to deduct the imperfect cubit. Sesokhris occurs also as the eighth king of the second dynasty, with the memorandum there also that he was in height five cubits, and three [palms] ; only by mistaking some crabbed and contracted writing of *παλαιστὰς*, and reading it *πλάτος* (*breadth* instead of *palms*), the transcriber has given us in that place the monstrous and impossible proportions of a man five cubits high, and three broad ! The height might pass, but not the proportionate breadth. Herodotus tells us that there were two monuments of Sesostris in Ionia, cut

in rocks ; the one in the road from Ephesus to Phœœa, the other in the road from Sardis to Smyrna, in each of which a man was sculptured, in size *four cubits and a half*², holding in his right hand a spear, and in his left a bow and arrows, and having the rest of his accoutrements and attire in like manner both Egyptian and Ethiopian.

3. The fifth dynasty in the list ascribed to Africanus, is wholly omitted in the list which goes under the name of Eusebius, in which the *fifth* is the same with the *sixth* in the other, beginning with OTHOES, who was slain by his own spearmen. OTHOES reappears as the first of the *ninth* dynasty, the name being slightly modified in spelling to AKHTHOES, who was the most tyrannical of all who had hitherto reigned in Egypt, and at last went to such insane lengths of fury that he was slain by a crocodile, that is, by the soldiery, or a military commander ; for the Egyptian army, with its commanders, and even with

² Μέγαθος πέμπτης σπιθαμῆς, Herod. ii. 106. Schweighæuser has shown that this does not mean, as many had supposed, in height five spans, or half cubits ; for five spans would be πέντε σπιθαμαὶ, not πέμπτη σπιθαμῆ. He instances τρίτον ἡμιτάλαντον, *two talents and a half*, &c. See note in the fifth volume of his Herodotus, p. 331, and Matthiæ's "Greek Grammar," No. 143. A mistake of the meaning of the phrase may possibly have led to the somewhat doubtful statement in Diodorus i. 45. 65. 94 (ed. Wesseling, vol. i. pp. 54. 75. 106), of the diminutive instead of gigantic stature of Bok-Khoris the Sophi, τῷ μὲν σώματι παντελῶς εὐκαταφρόνητος, which Poggius renders, however, "corpo quidem robusto ac valido," as if reading οὐ καταφρονητός. But probably the best account which we can give of the matter will be found in the fact that not only Sesostris the Great, but also Sesostris the Second, had the name of Bok-Khoris ; and the second might naturally seem of a stature easily despised after the gigantic measure of the former. The second was properly distinguished as "Bok-Khoris the Just," but both were Sophis.

the king at its head, was understood by that emblem³. The use of figurative appellations, and the representation of these by figurative emblems among the Egyptians, are known facts, and may be illustrated in this instance by two passages of Eusebius in his “*Præparatio Evangelica*,” the second of which probably refers to this very same historical occurrence. Anubis, he tells us, was stated by the Egyptians to be represented with a dog’s head, as having been *a prætorian soldier of Osiris*,—one, as it were, *of his hunting dogs or guards*: and in the same chapter he mentions one of their kings, who being pursued by *his own dogs*, fled towards the lake, and was marvellously taken up by a *crocodile* and carried to the other side⁴. This king may be the same, not Anubis, but one whose name might be suggested by the sound, KNUPHIS, or KNEPH-AKHTHOS, called also AKHTHOËS, OTHOËS, and THOËS, who was *helped* across the mysterious *lake* by one of his own officers.

The incident, which is remarkable as indicating the existence of a standing military force, may excite a suspicion that this is the same king who is also in the twelfth dynasty called AMMENEMÈS, who was slain by his own officers, and who is placed in the list as the predecessor of SESOSTRIS, by whom the military force is said to have been first perfectly organized. Ammenemès indeed is one of those names which seems in these dynasties, if they are treated as successive, to be going about uncertain

³ Ezek. xxix. 3—8. Bochart remarks that the word Pharaoh, פַּרְעֹה, in the Arabic, is even used for a crocodile. The word χάμψαι, crocodile, is also found in conjunction with royal names, as Nekhempson.

⁴ Euseb. “*Præp. Evang.*” ii. 1, p. 49, 50. Edit. fol. Colon. 1688.

where to rest. Probably there were several kings who bore that title. He appears first following sixteen nameless kings in the eleventh dynasty of the list ascribed to Africanus,—“after whom **AMMENEMES**.” The first syllable is a form of the article similar to that of the Hebrew (א) which has that form, and usually doubles the initial consonant of the word to which it is prefixed, **Ammenemes**; just as we find the name of Manetho himself written “Khemmanetho,” in the next sentence. Now, nothing is mentioned of the eleventh dynasty, except that it was Diospolitan, consisting of sixteen kings, who reigned forty-three years, “*after whom Ammenemēs*.” I suspect that the number should be (not ἕτη μῆνις, but ἕτη νυμῆνις,) 443 years; that being the duration of the reigns of the first fifteen kings, beginning from Menēs; and if Menēs be counted in addition to them the number is sixteen. In placing **AMMENEMES** next after them, the Shepherd dynasty is skipped, and the strictly native succession alone counted. The name **AMMENEMES** is a corruption or imperfect pronunciation of **AMMENOPHIS**, or **MENOPHIS**, signifying “the Memphian:” and hence we find Sesostris stated to have been the son of *Ammenemēs*, in the twelfth dynasty of the list attributed to Africanus, while he is said by Manetho, as quoted by Josephus, to have been the son of *Ammenophis*, in the eighteenth dynasty. But the Memphian, who is here mentioned as following the first sixteen, is probably the king who restored the native sovereignty at Memphis, after the interruption of it by the invading Shepherds. The name is also written, by a very intelligible corruption of Menophis, **Μνενῆς** (Diodor. i. 94), as the name of the royal legislator under whom, on the recommendation of Thoth, the

laws were first committed to writing. And we find it in the same form, *Mνεῦς*, applied to one of the two sacred bulls, no doubt “the Memphian.”

The kings of the third, fourth, sixth, twelfth, and, we may add, eighteenth dynasties, thus come into comparison; and we observe among them occasionally a recurrence of the same names, with the variations resulting from the rendering of Oriental words into Greek spelling. ZOÜPHIS of the third dynasty has some relation to SOUPHIS, the name given to two kings of the fourth, and again to two of the sixth, among whom, or associated with them, occur the builders of the pyramids, KHEOPS, or PHIOPS, MENKHERES, MEKHERINUS⁶, MYKERINUS⁷, or KHENKHERES⁸; LAKHARES⁹, or LABARIS¹, the founder of the labyrinth in Arsinoë; SESOSTRIS the conqueror, also called SESOÖSIS, by abbreviation of SESOG-KHÖSIS, that is, Sheykh of Cush; who may be concluded, by the measurements given, to be the SESAK-OKHRIS, or, “conquering Sheykh,” by contraction SESÖKHRIS, who was of gigantic stature, and who seems therefore to have been the same called APAPPUS, which Eratosthenes interprets *μέγιστος*, the giant², a centenarian in age, by which he is brought into comparison, if not identification, with the centenarian PHIOPS. NITOKRIS, the imperial beauty who, according to Herodotus, built the third pyramid from the offerings of her lovers, and who is mentioned in the

⁶ See above, p. 80.

⁷ So Diodorus writes it.

⁸ So Herodotus.

⁹ Χερχέρης, eleventh king of eighteenth dynasty. Eusebius appends this memorandum to his name, that in his reign Moses conducted the departure of the Israelites out of Egypt.

¹ So the pseudo-Africanus.

¹ So the pseudo-Eusebius.

² List of Theban kings. Comp. Jablonski's *Voces Ägyptiacæ* in Valpy's edit. of *Stephani Thesaur. Ling. Gr.*, voce *Ἀπαππός*.

so-called sixth dynasty, may be the same with the Queen ΑΚΟΚΗΡΙΣ, or ΑΚΕΚΗΡΕΣ, of Josephus, in the eighteenth dynasty; and also with the Queen ΣΚΕΜΙΟΦΗΡΙΣ of the so-called twelfth dynasty, a contemporary of ΣΕΣΟΣΤΡΙΣ and ΛΑΚΗΡΕΣ, whose name is not without some traceable relation to these others, if the prefixed syllable *Ske* be withdrawn, and the name Miophris analyzed.

The syllable *Mi*, which is found also in *Miamûn*, seems there to be equivalent in force to the Hebrew prefix *מ* or preposition *מ* (*Mi* or *Min*) signifying "from." Thus *Miamûn* would be equivalent in force to *De-Amûn*, or *Ἀμμωνόδοτος*, "Jove-given," or "Sprung from Amûn"; and, if so, Miophris may signify *De-Hophra*, "descendant of Hophra,"—a "Pharaoh's Daughter." There was somewhat earlier a king *Oὐενέφρης*, *Venéphrê*, or *Βινόφηρις*, that is, *Hophra*, which is also written *Οὐάφρης*, *Vaphrê*; and in his reign it was that the law was passed enabling women to succeed to the throne³. It was not unnatural, therefore, that a princess of his descendants should be named with an allusion to this. Moreover, about this very time one of the monarchs appears to have borne the name of *RHAMESES HOPHRA*, or *RHAMESES, DESCENDANT OF HOPHRA* (*Ραμεσσονάφρης*, or *Ραμεσσῆν Οὐάφρον*), so that there is proof of the continuance or revival of the name's celebrity. Strictly speaking *NITOKRIS* is not her personal name, but a complimentary title,

³ Similarly the name *Manetho* (*Μανέθως*) has been supposed by Bunsen to be resolvable into *Maveθôθ*, "Ægyptiace Ma-n-Thoth, i. e. datus-a-Thoth," equivalent to Hermodorus. Mulleri "Fragm. Hist. Gr."

⁴ See my conspectus of the dynasties, Column III. third king, and the catalogue of kings in Chap. IX. under the name Nitokris.

signifying “The Minerva, that brings victory.” But there were not so many queens who reigned as to render the identity doubtful. The priests informed Herodotus that only one native queen had reigned, and she Nitokris. That may not be strictly accurate. But the daughter of VENEPHRÈS, in whose favour at first the right of female succession was established, married; and by her an Ethiopian or Theban dynasty was thus admitted to the throne, though the native succession really was not broken, but transmitted through her. This marriage, by at once bringing a king into power, seems to have removed the ostensible peculiarity of a female reign, and left only the established precedent of female right, without the conspicuous female administration of affairs, which was practically illustrated later in the female regency of NITOKRIS. In the eighteenth dynasty, as before remarked, this queen is called AKEKHRÈS, according to the reading of Josephus. In the version of the same dynasty attributed to Africanus, that name is softened into AKHEERRÈS. The seeming reduplication in *Akokhris*, or *Akekhrès*, appears to me to be a fragment of the word Sesak: for SESAK-OCHRIS by abbreviation has become SESOKHRIS; and also, losing sight of the separate meaning of Sesak, the latter syllable of that word has sometimes been joined on to Okhris, as if it had been Ses-Akokhris; then, dropping the no longer intelligible prefix, “AKOKHRIS.” The reader who is at all acquainted with Horne Tooke’s “Diversions of Purley,” of which the Archbishop of Dublin has made good use in his book on “Words,” will recognize in these changes only the winged principle of words and syllables, and their tendency to fly away, which that author so ingeniously illustrates in the etymology of

our own language. Queen-regent AKEKHRÈS (or MIOPHRIS, as she is also called) is said to have been the sister of RHATHÔTIS⁵; and from her recorded complexion⁶ she came to be called RHODÔPIS, as Herodotus informs us that the builder of her pyramid was named by some⁷. The variation of her name to NITOKRIS is known to have arisen from prefixing to the name or appellation OKHRIS, the complimentary title of the Egyptian Minerva, NEITH. Eratosthenes tells us this; and as he interprets her whole name *Ἀθηνᾶ νικηφόρος*, “Minerva the giver of victory,” we find thence that the name or designation “OKHRIS” signifies “conquering⁸,” and that, therefore, SESAK-OKHRIS, or contracted SESÔKHRIS, may be interpreted “The conquering Sheykh.”

Nitokris is named by Eratosthenes, in the Theban list of sovereigns, next but one after the centenarian APAPPOS, who is the same undoubtedly with APHIOPS or PHIOPS, the centenarian of the sixth dynasty, one of the family who took the title of Sophi, and probably no other than KHEOPS, the builder of the great pyramid, the SOUPHIS or philosopher of the fourth dynasty, by nation or at least by nurture and education AI-THIOPS, “an Ethiopian,” which has been the source of much transmutation of name, and multiplication of person, by the simple interchange of the aspirated letters. Her first regency of six years ought probably to be placed within the reign of Sesostris the Great, and towards its close; but she had a renewal of her regency for six years more

⁵ So Josephus, after Manetho.

⁶ Ξανθὴ τὴν χροιὰν, Dyn. VI., Pseudo-Africanus.

⁷ Herod. ii. 134, 135.

⁸ Jablonski compares it with a Coptic word which means a deliverer or saviour.

in the minority of Sesostris II. Hence her reign is stated sometimes at *twelve* years. She is mentioned before Sesostris by Herodotus⁹, who says she was called to the throne by the people after they had assassinated her brother. This must have been her second regency. She was manifestly not of pure Egyptian race, but had in her complexion a trace of descent from a foreign princess, for she was golden-haired¹; not improbably, then, a descendant of the Greek Io, daughter of Inachus. Io came to Egypt from Assyria², and hence might be regarded by the Egyptians less as a native of the then recent and comparatively obscure colony of Greece, than as an ASSYRIAN lady, and so called ATHYR, a wider and more imperial designation for the distinguished foreigner, who, in consequence of her surpassing beauty, became the Egyptian VENUS³, nay, was even honoured as their Isis: after whom also Sesostris the Great seems to have called his daughter ATHYRTIS, as Diodorus tells us that she was named⁴. The desire of the ancients to settle the relative position of Inachus in the chronology of Egypt, may result

⁹ Herod. ii. 100.

¹ This quality seems to have been characteristic of an illustrious family, if it be true that there is mention in their "Book of the Dead" of the "souls of the red-haired."

² Æsch. "Prom. Vinct." 703. 732. 805—813. 849, &c. Jablon-ski, "Panth. Æg." lib. iii. c. 1. Io became identified with the Egyptian crescent-horned deity Isis, and was worshipped. The gods of the Egyptians were declared by their own priests to have been men and women. Diodor. ap. Euseb. "Præp. Ev." lib. ii. c. 1.

³ Their Venus was called Athyr. Like her descendant Nitokris, she seems to have been golden-haired, hence called by the natives from old tradition the *golden* Venus. Diodor. i. 97, edit. Wesseling, vol. i. p. 109.

⁴ Diod. i. 53, ed. Wesseling, vol. i. p. 63.

from this circumstance of the descent of the great Sesostris from Io, which well accords with a European cast of features discernible in his statues.

The kings of the eighteenth dynasty are associated by Josephus with the times of the Israelites, their oppression, and their Exodus : and the author of that list of the dynasties which has been erroneously attributed to Eusebius, appends a note to the name of Khenkherê of that dynasty, that it was in his reign that the Exodus took place.

I trust my reader will not despise the collateral evidence arising from the comparison and analysis of names, and the indications thence arising of the identity of persons, who, by reproduction of the same under slight variations, have been made each into two, three, half a dozen, or even, it may be, eighteen. Little indeed can be built upon mere names apart from other considerations : the probability or improbability must depend upon the combination of many other circumstances. And yet it is only by an array of altered or corrupted names and fabricated numbers, that the world has permitted itself to be so grossly imposed upon in these dynasties ; and that, too, in the face of the obvious fact, that there is a great difference between the two fabricated lists, which pass erroneously under the names of Africanus and Eusebius, and that, as they stand, they have few points of similarity to the list or lists of Eratosthenes. There is, I doubt not, some ultimate foundation of truth, on which the stupid and blundering fabrication has been created. The instances which have been given may suffice to prepare the reader for the result of a more extended comparison of the first eighteen, or indeed nineteen alleged dynasties, together with the twenty-second ;

in which, by placing them, with the exception of the seventeenth, in parallelism with one another, and with five portions of the list of Eratosthenes, they are shown to be chiefly one and the same, namely the eighteenth, or eighteenth and nineteenth. The seventeenth dynasty remains distinct and separate ; but there are not more than two or three names which can be produced belonging to the generations preceding it, and one of these is that of Menès himself. In regard to the rest, they are shown not merely to have partial correspondences, but in two well-defined instances, those of Thoës and Sesostris, the same individual man is traced through all, or almost all these so-called dynasties : while in other instances the same result is presented in a less perfect degree. Using these as the clue to readjustment, it will be found that the reconstruction of this one dynasty, the eighteenth (or, if it be preferred to divide it, the eighteenth and nineteenth together), is established in its main points, and may be considered not far from complete. The decipherers of hieroglyphic names and inscriptions, reading an unknown tongue by an unknown character, in which, as Sir G. Cornewall Lewis has well remarked, they encounter the difficulty of many varying symbols to express each letter of the alphabet, and many varying letters which each of these symbols may express, have hitherto ventured to derive much assistance from these fabricated dynasties ; and this, no doubt, is to be principally blamed for that immense distortion of the truth of history and chronology in which they have so often permitted themselves to be involved. It will therefore, I trust, not be disagreeable to them, but of perceptible service, to have the genuine testimony of Manetho extricated from the demonstrable

perversions of some blundering or fraudulent compilers, by which it has been, and has long remained, so utterly falsified.

It will readily be pardoned, if we should only partially succeed in the unpromising attempt to reduce these, which, as they now stand, are palpable blunders and fabrications, into one consistent statement of truth. Yet it may be observed that the fabrication consists in the manufacture of a variety of successive dynasties out of the tablets and materials of one. For we return to the fact that Manetho never had thirty dynasties exclusive of the gods and semi-divine kings, but only sixteen; there being placed before these, *thirteen* of the gods, each honoured with a separate dynasty, and *one* dynasty of the semi-divine kings; so that the first three dynasties of mortals are the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth, of which the two former are taken to round off the twenty-fourth Canicular Cycle, and the final cycle in the Manethonian scheme begins with the seventeenth dynasty. There is a certain amount of error and confusion implied in dating the commencement of the cycle so early in the history. This, and its causes, which are partly to be found in the confusion of the Israelites with the earlier Shepherds, we shall be able to demonstrate. But that this is the genuine system of Manetho may be supported not only from the perfect manner in which we find every difficulty solved by it, from the minuteness of correspondence in the results, and from the satisfactory answer which every objection has admitted of, but also from the incidental evidence of several ancient authorities, indicating its existence in the day of Iamblichus⁵, and its acceptance as

⁵ Above, p. 140.

Manetho's by Eusebius, the reference to it by an author believed to be he⁶, the indirect allusion to it by Julius Africanus⁷, its reasonable correspondence with Diodorus, the agreement of the author of the extracts from Eusebius, Africanus, and others⁸, and the extreme improbability, or rather proved impossibility, of its having been invented after the introduction of the Julian computation⁹. Finally, Manetho, and the Alexandrian Jews who translated the books of Moses, did not live three thousand years apart, but in the same reign, and under the patronage of the same king; nor were they, either the one or the other, so lamentably ignorant of the evidence then existing, as to place their chronologies three thousand years asunder, and this without their knowing, or any body else at that time knowing or suspecting, that they had done so.

I subjoin at the close of this Chapter a conspectus of the first nineteen alleged dynasties, as well as the twenty-second and twenty-fourth, in their original Greek; and, in the next Chapters a carefully digested catalogue will be given of the kings in their order, with copious references and illustration; which it is hoped will facilitate the learned reader's estimate of the fabricated succession of those dynasties, erroneously attributed to Manetho, and no less erroneously supposed to have been transmitted as his by Julius Africanus and Eusebius, both of whom were entirely innocent and utterly ignorant of it. I do not find reason to assume that the separate lists were not

⁶ Above, pp. 129, 130, 142—144 *note*. See also below in Chap. VII., under the name Konkharis.

⁷ Above, p. 145.

⁸ Shown at large in the present Chapter.

⁹ Above, pp. 111—115.

formed out of genuine materials. They are, no doubt, dynastic lists, though not successive dynasties. The word *δυναστεία*, it may be remarked, has, as used by Apollodorus, nothing to do with a *dynasty* in our sense of the word, that is, as designating a family succession of kings.

In regard to the *Conspectus*, the text followed has been Scaliger's; which I have preferred as being free from the bias of more modern critics, and free from the amendments or perversions with which they have conjecturally modified it, which the reader who chooses may abundantly find in Bunsen's "Egypt," and in Mueller's *Fragmēta Historicorum Græcorum*. The order of the reigns in the dynastic lists has not been disturbed by me: but as we have direct evidence that the dynasties were sometimes differently divided, their internal evidence has been followed in several cases in separating one list into two. Wherever this is done it is so stated; and the order of the names is in all other respects preserved. The result is that there comes out a variety of duplicate lists of **ONE AND THE SAME DYNASTY**; some being corrupted renderings from partially obliterated tablets. By a careful inspection it will be found that one and the same person may be distinctly traced across the whole breadth of the parallel columns. This appears to me conclusively the case in regard to the king against whom on the left-hand margin stands the numeral X. and also in great part as regards the king his father, numbered VII. on the same margin; in direct descent from whom (leaving out two intervening reigns, or more properly regencies during a long minority) the numeral position of the former would be VIII., as Diodorus numbers him, following a consecutive chain of seven. In others also a similar identity of person

may be traced, with less completeness but still with sufficient indications to support the same conclusion.

The carefully digested and copiously illustrated catalogue of the kings which is given in the next Chapters supplies in a condensed form much of what is necessary to the comparison and verification of the view presented by the evidence. And further information and means of verifying the results of our inquiry are afforded in the notes in the Appendix of the present work. The last will be found useful in illustrating the variation of names, in consequence of the spelling; and of numbers, from the notation; as well as several special portions of the history. The reader may also be reminded that the possession of several names by the same historic character is familiar to us in the annals of other lands besides Egypt: as Cicero and Tully are the same; Scipio and Africanus; Octavianus and Augustus, the last of which, as well as Cæsar, belongs also to the Roman Emperors in common. So Marcus, Aurelius, Antoninus, Philosophus, Augustus, designate one man; and sometimes one, sometimes another, of the names is employed. If the titles of the Roman Emperors assumed from nations triumphed over be taken into account, a considerable addition will be made to the variety of the nomenclature—Persicus, Hispanicus, Gothicus, Vandalicus, and others. Just so in Egypt the same king appears sometimes under different titles, and confusion has resulted from want of attention to this circumstance.

Perhaps this may be the most proper place to gather into one view from internal and other evidence some general judgment of those alleged Manethonian successions of dynasties, which have been thus referred by Syncellus to the collections of Eusebius

LISTING IN OUTLINE

XVI.

*TWENTY-SECOND
DYNASTY,
AND TWENTY-FOURTH¹,
from the Lists ascribed to
Africanus and Eusebius compared.*

Bubastite.

A'. Σέσογχις [Σεσόγχωσις], κα'
If we decide by the evidence
of the corresponding list
which passes under the name
of Eusebius, this name and
the next belong to the two
nearest predecessors of Takel-
ôthes, as see below.

B'. Ονσόρθων,

XVII.

*Eratosthenes' List of Theban
Kings.
Second Portion or Tablet.*

Παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις ἐτύγχανεν
ιστό δυναστεία, καθ' ἣν ἐβασι-
λευσαν Θηβαῖοι ἔτη ρῖ, ἐν
τοις δὲ ἀπτιγράφοις, pⁱⁱ

See above, p. 83.

9. Μάρης, δ ἐστιν Ἡλιόδωρος, κα'
This name seems to have
been applied also to the
successor or two successors
of this king, hence not
named in this portion of the
list. And it was probably
in the reign of Venephrēs
that the greatest works
attributed to Mœris were
executed.

ιε'



and Africanus. It has been observed that, though spurious as lists of successive dynasties, and in that character at least erroneously ascribed to these authors, and though utterly false in the use which has been made of them in their summation, they may nevertheless be not destitute of some value, nor deserve to be altogether repudiated, if they may afford some collateral evidence, though of obscure antiquity and apocryphal source.

They may be received as a collection of distinct and separate dynastic lists, put together by some unknown and illiterate hands, probably Jewish, having been obtained possibly in part from the works of Manetho, and ultimately from tablets and other documentary sources, in various cities, but unconnected each with the other; the larger portion forming historically no series whatever, beyond the series of kings in each of the detached dynastic tablets. Sometimes even two lists of the same, placed one at the head of the other, are put together as one dynasty. Much more from different cities, different lists of the same period and dynasty might be obtained, with occasional variations of titles, and difference of treatment, sometimes full, sometimes abridged, sometimes by lineal descent from father to son, sometimes in the order of succession, with or without regencies ; all which it would plainly be unreasonable to sum together. Just so, if two Victorian tablets should be found by the prospective New Zealander whom Macaulay supposes hereafter studying the remains of London, one of them containing George III., the Duke of Kent, Victoria ; and the other, George III., the Regent Prince of Wales, George IV., William IV., Victoria ; the difference might perplex him, though intelligible to us : and he

might treat them as successive, postfixing the former; and in Bunsen's manner rectifying the *obvious error* in the number attached to the first name by the simple addition of two strokes. So we should have five Georges and two Victorias.

Some respectable Greek authors also have fallen into the error of placing collateral tablets of substantially the same dynastic lists, monumental or other, in a consecutive series; and in particular Eratosthenes, in his series of Theban kings, has been deceived into doing this. The Greeks, ingenious and philosophical as they were, yet were children in archæology. The Egyptians, proud of antiquity, and prone to exaggerate it, favoured the delusion. But by careful analysis and comparison the mistake or the fraud admits of demonstration.

There are some indications that the information furnished to us in the so-called Manethonian dynastic lists has come through Hebrew channels. In itself this would not be improbable, considering the great numbers of the Jews who were settled at Alexandria and in other parts of Egypt, and, at the same time, the close relation in which the early history of Egypt stood to that of Israel, in consequence of which the Jews might naturally feel interested in Egyptian antiquities. The indications which lead me to the conclusion are incidental and minute, but of frequent occurrence. I may give the following instances:—

1. The frequent occurrence of the Hebrew article ה (Ha or A) in combination with proper names. That article has the property of generally doubling the initial consonant of the word, to which it is attached in the manner of an inseparable particle. Thus Menophis, Ammenophis, and (by an undeniable variation of the same word slightly corrupted in its

termination) *Ammenemê*s. In like manner Manetho, *Khemmanetho*; Marês, Moeris, and Merês, *Ammerê*s. The reduplication is not always preserved in the writing of these and other names, but we have also *Amenophis*, *Amenemê*s, *Amenuphos*. This variation or uncertainty of practice may be accounted for by the circumstance that in the Hebrew it is not the practice to write the initial letter twice when the article is prefixed, but only to point it to be *read* double. Hence the doubling, or *not* doubling, of the letter in the Greek character would depend upon the regard paid to a mere *point*; and the points might or might not be written. So also *Tyris* or *Thyris*, *Thuris*, *Thuôris*, and *Soris*, with the article combined, *Athyris*, or *Athuris*, *Athôris*; *Myrtæus*, *Amyrtæus*; *Khærê*s and *Kherrê*s, *Akherê*s and *Akherrê*s; *Kenkerê*s, *Akhenkerê*s; *Thoth*, *Athothê*s, or, with a prefix of honour, *Rha-thotis*.

2. The great variations of the name *Thoê*s are such as would be accounted for by the Hebrew guttural letter *y* as the initial of the word, for that letter is variously represented as *O*, *Akh*, *Gu*, or else may be left silent. Hence *Othoê*s, *Othê*s, *Akhthoê*s, *Akhthos*, *Guthô*s, and *Thoê*s, also written *Thoulê*s.

3. The Hebrew preposition *בְּ* or *בִּ* ("from") appears in the formation of *Μιαμμοῦν* and *Μιόφρις*; the former meaning "sprung FROM *AMÛN*," "*Αμμωνόδοτος*"; the latter "descended FROM *HOPHRA* or *VENEPHRES*." This indication, if taken alone, perhaps may be doubtful, as in Bunsen's Egyptian Vocabulary *M* is given with the sense of *through*, *by*, or *of*¹. But whence so?

4. The confusion implied in the corruption of the name '*Ραμεσσῆ*s, '*Ραμεσῆ*s, '*Ραμσῆ*s, or for

¹ Bunsen, "Egypt," vol. i. p. 468.

euphony 'Ραμψῆς, into 'Ραψάκης (i. e. 'Ραβσάκης, LXX), in other words, the transmutation of Rhamses into Rabshakeh, is such as would only be made by a Hebrew.

5. The disregard of the difference of the long and short O, and long and short E, with other characteristics in the variations of the writing of the names, does not savour of the more competent Greek scholarship which may be attributed to Manetho, but presents Greek of a similar barbaric description to the Latinity of the "Excerpta Barbara;" in which last the traditional Jewish tendency may be traced in the humour of assigning Apion, the Grammarian, the enemy of the Jews and calumniator of their history, a place in the divine dynasties next to the *latrator Anubis*.

It is vain to seek in hieroglyphic inscriptions for any thing corresponding to corrupted, distorted, and curtailed Barbaric-Greek forms of words.

6. One adjunct to the name of a tyrant and persecutor of the Hebrews, Othoës, who was ultimately assassinated by his own guards, may suggest, in the way of historical allusion, a Hebrew view of his character and fate, if (as I think) it be he who is called *Takel-Othës*: "Thou art weighed in the balance and found wanting." It has been professed no doubt to find the name Takelet or Takeloth in hieroglyphics. What other reading of the said hieroglyphic may hereafter be discovered we do not presume to guess, but Bunsen informs us that the sign or name read *Hem* by most is read by Mr. Birch *Cherp*².

7. The numeral mark for 90 (ፅ) appears to me in one instance to have been mistaken for λ' 30; and if

² "Egypt's Place," &c., *Engl. transl.*, vol. i. p. 44.

so, the mistake probably may be traced through its resemblance to the Hebrew ַ, and was therefore more likely to be made by a Hebrew.

The reader may not be prepared to acquiesce at once in these remarks, nor do I wish it without inquiry, but they may yet be sufficient to invite his attention to the careful comparison of the first and larger half of the dynasties which will be now submitted to him, and may be worth considering in union with the other evidence.

CHAPTER VII.

A CATALOGUE OF EGYPTIAN KINGS IN THEIR ORDER, DIGESTED FROM THE DATA OF MANETHO, ERATOSTHENES, DIODORUS, AND EUSEBIUS, ANALYZED AND RESTORED, AS COMPARED WITH OTHER ANCIENT EVIDENCE.—PART I. TO THE CLOSE OF THE SHEPHERD DYNASTY.

IN the present Chapter it was at first intended to give simply a catalogue of the Egyptian kings in their order, setting down the various names and titles, or corruptions of names and titles, applied to them in various passages of the same or different authors, and giving some short analysis of these, with a view to assist the reader in tracing the identity of persons. I am aware that many of the names have been attempted to be differently spelt out in hieroglyphics; but the analysis of names which are transmitted to us often corruptly in the Greek, should first be pursued in that language, to the recovery as far as possible of the radical forms, before attempting to find them in the hieroglyphics. And as the dynasties ascribed to Manetho have in other more important points palpably misled those who have been engaged in Egyptological studies, I trust that hieroglyphical scholars will not think me negligent of their conclusions in directing my attention to an analysis based on the Greek, and particularly on the Greek of these apocryphal dynasties. An analysis

of this nature, if satisfactorily executed, may afford a preparation for better success, even in their hieroglyphical department, on which I have not entrenched. But manifestly hitherto Egyptologists have taken many liberties in the way of altering names, against the testimony of antiquity, and on very equivocal evidence, if it can be called evidence, from hieroglyphics, without sufficient regard to the fact that alphabetic writing, in the characters of known languages, is at least a safer guide as to the sound of words than can be found in hieroglyphic signs and symbols. To take one or two instances. The name *Sesonkhōsis* seems to have had something to do with their adoption of the form *Sheshonk* for *Shishak*, or *Sesak*; but if so, the research which we have already made tends to show that they have been mistaken as to the nature of that word. And they themselves apparently feel dissatisfied with their conclusions as to it, for they are now getting rid of *Sesonkhōsis*, yet, I fear, only groping further into the dark. The changes present a somewhat curious history. The late Duke of Northumberland and Colonel Felix first thought they deciphered on an obelisk the name of *Osirtesen*¹, as that of an ancient king; whether or not the name *Tosertasis* in the third dynasty of the pseudo-Africanus furnished the suggestion. Sir Gardener Wilkinson subsequently thought he found the same in the Tablet of Karnak. This Rosellini questioned. And not till after Champollion was dead, was it known or supposed that he favoured the discovery², which however gradually made its way, but the name got changed to *Osortesen*. Then came Dr. Lepsius, and

¹ Bunsen, "Egypt," vol. ii. p. 250.

² *Ibid.* p. 251.

discovered “that the sign which had hitherto been read *user* or *oser*, must be pronounced *seser*, INAS- MUCH AS THE NAMES SESONCHOSIS AND SESOSTRIS IN MANETHO CANNOT BE EXPLAINED UPON ANY OTHER PRIN- CIPLE³.” (Is this *hieroglyphical* evidence?) Thus *Osirtesen* was transmuted to *Sesortesen*, which is next substituted for SESOSTRIS, with no authority for such a change: and then one noble step more! SESONKHÔSIS also is turned out, and the transmuted name *Sesortôsis* takes his place in lists of kings, and in the talk of the learned, and we even hear of the SESORTÔSIDÆ! Nay, the same threatens to make its way into the alteration of ancient authors⁴. Such is the rapid progress of what is called discovery! I trust my reader will not be displeased with me for giving a second instance. There is mentioned a name “AMYRTÆUS,” also called “MYRTÆUS;” and it seems there is a various reading of one place in a fragment of Eratosthenes, in which he is called “AMUTHARTÆUS.” There is also a king mentioned by Josephus, “TIMAUS.” Bunsen has transmuted the one into the other. Shall I tell my learned reader how? The unlearned will pardon me and pass it over, with other things of the like nature. Josephus has given the following words as an extract from Manetho: “We had a king by name Timaus, &c.—ἐγένετο βασιλεὺς ἡμῖν, Τίμαος ὄνομα.” On the ground of the few brief fragments of Manetho which have come down to us, of which this is *one*, Bunsen determined that Manetho never wrote thus in the first person! For ἡμῖν Τίμαος he decided that we are to read in one word *AMORTNTIMAIOS*,—

³ Bunsen, “Egypt,” vol. ii. p. 255.

⁴ Bunsen, “Egypt,” vol. i. p. 682 A. “Buttmannus in Quæ-
tionibus de Dicæarcho.”

“There was a king **AMUNTIMÆUS**.” This is to be the true name. *Myrtæus*, *Amyrthæus*, or *Amuthartæus*, is to be dispossessed, and **AMUNTIMÆUS** is to be installed instead, among the genuine hieroglyphical readings! *Sic corrige meo periculo*, as says the celebrated Martinus Scriblerus, in whose emendations of Virgil⁵ this too ingenious criticism of Bunsen alone has any parallel. But this too is to find its way into editions as a various reading⁶. A wholly conjectural alteration of Manetho is proposed; and then the altered reading is used in evidence to support an alteration of Eratosthenes⁷!

These remarks may justify me in breaking the fetters of such unsatisfactory authority, and adopting a different method of research; in which, whatever ordeal I may be exposed to, I would bespeak only a candid judgment, to deal fairly by the evidence which may be produced. My object is never to concoct new names, but rather to reconcile and explain old variations as they present themselves. Many of the variations of names and numbers will also be found afterwards illustrated more fully, in Note A at the end of the volume.

A brief and very condensed digest of evidence was also intended to be given, as a running accompaniment of the catalogue, as far as space permitted. The importance, however, of this last feature of what was proposed, has grown so gradually, and so greatly beyond what was anticipated, by the accumulation of facts, spontaneously falling into their natural places, that it has overbalanced the form originally designed, while it has conferred a

⁵ Pope’s Works.

⁶ See Mueller, *Fragm. Hist. Gr.* ii. 565.

⁷ Bunsen, “Egypt,” i. 644, 675.

value much beyond that consideration, in the copiousness of proof and decisiveness of the result. This will be found the case in regard to the fulness of illustration of the Shepherd dynasty, as to which many interesting particulars have been brought together, tending towards their own mutual explanation and arrangement. Some clear and decisive evidence as to certain facts and points of time has also been found and established, partly by a process which Sir Isaac Newton pointed out, but which he failed to apply successfully, in consequence of setting himself to reduce the antiquity of the early Egyptian history much below what was really consistent with the facts. The result to which this process has conducted, I have been enabled to confirm by another calculation, based on a totally distinct principle, which has yielded a conclusion in remarkable agreement; and again, both have been confirmed by a third process, based on the analysis of the scientific evidence involved in a statement of Censorinus. Some evidence has also presented itself incidentally, as to the duration of the Israelite sojourn in Egypt. This accumulation of important matter has rendered it necessary to divide the subject originally intended for one chapter into four.

It may be proper to state that in the earlier period I have omitted such names occurring in the list of Syncellus or Eusebius as have apparently been inserted only to fill up, and which are most likely not from the hand of Eusebius. But the omission of these names has been allowed for in the enumeration of the kings, which I have given from Mizraim downwards, and also in brackets from Menès or Nimrod.

The present chapter, then, will embrace only the

first part of the catalogue, extending onward to the close of the Shepherd dynasty.

1. MIZRAIM, the first colonizer of Egypt, but not properly to be classed with their kings, is taken by Syncellus for MENÈS, but erroneously so. If, however, as some would have it, eight generations of successors of Menès were to be prefixed to that which we have taken as the reckoning of Diodorus⁸, then, counting also Bousiris distinct from Menès, as if one of his descendants, this would bring Menès into coincidence with Mizraim, a result accepted by Eusebius, or at least by Syncellus, and which is at the basis of his enumeration of the kings of Egypt. This tracing of their succession back to Mizraim may have been introduced by the Mizraite Shepherds; but afterwards it became confused with that which was previously in use, and which was subsequently revived, of reckoning back to Menès as the founder of the throne and kingdom. The colonization of the country by settlers of the race of Mizraim had, no doubt, taken place long previously to Menès, but that is not to be confounded with the kingdom. Mizraim himself, being seven hundred years before the close of the reign of Konkharès, properly belonged to the period of the “semi-divine kings,” as Manetho calls the early postdiluvian patriarchs.

* * * *

[9. MENÈS;—NIMROD, FOUNDER OF THE CUSHITE, OR HAMITE EMPIRE, BUILDER OF ERECH, OR URCHOË, hence called EREKHÖPHÈS, or URKHOËUS; also called OSIRIS, or B'OUSIRIS, that is Lord of *Asshur*, or Assyria, whither Nimrod went, and built Nineveh.

⁸ This is done by Sir G. Cornewall Lewis and others, on the ground of the statements of Diodorus noticed above at p. 72.

That Egypt was thus early connected, through the person of Nimrod, with the empire of Assyria, is supported by the following early traditional testimony quoted by the author of the “*Chronicon Paschale*,” from the “*Recognitions of Clement*,” which, though apocryphal, are yet certainly an early work, being cited repeatedly by Origen. *Οὗτος ὁ Νεβρῶδ μετοικήσας ἀπὸ Αἰγύπτου εἰς Ἀσσυρίους, καὶ οἰκήσας εἰς Νῦνον πόλιν, &c.*⁹ Though the statement is introduced in a fabulous narrative as St. Peter’s, it is nevertheless remarkable as preserving, in this particular, a vestige of a then known *earlier* tradition, corroborative of a conclusion which we have formed on other and altogether independent grounds. Heyne in his edition of “*Apollodorus*” (Gottingæ, 1803, p. 409), expresses his opinion that the statement was probably taken from that learned Greek, from an iambic line in the sequel of the passage quoted¹⁰. The author of the “*Chronicon Paschale*,” in the same place, speaks also of Nimrod as *ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ κληρωθεὶς*, having received his proper allotment in Egypt, and having gone thence to Babylon. If so, in whom, or under what name, does he appear in Egyptian history, except in Menès?]

(0.) 10. B’OUSIRIS ; EREKHÖPHÉS, or URKHOÆUS (Diodor.) ; the first of the title, *the same with Menès, or Nimrod*, but sometimes reckoned, as if a distinct person, his first successor, as by Diodorus, above, p. 81.

N.B. The interval from Menès to the close of

⁹ *Chron. Pasch.* ed. Ducange, fol. p. 28. Ducange, in the notes, gives reference to “*Recog. Clem.*” i. n. 30; iv. n. 29.

¹⁰ *Αὐτὸν Νῦνον τὸν Νεβρῶδ οἱ Ἀσσύριοι προστηγόρευσαν, “Οὗτος διδάσκει Ἀσσυρίους σέβειν τὸ πῦρ.”* “*Vides iambum, qui forte ex Apollodoro fluxerat.*”

the reign of Konkharêš, or beginning of the Shepherd dynasty, is reckoned by Manetho fifteen generations, or 443 years. Menêš and fifteen successors, including Konkharêš, are probably the sixteen Diospolites of the Eleventh Dynasty so called, “after whom Ammenemêš.” On which reckoning it will be observed that the Shepherd dynasty is left out, as being not native, though it intervened before the “Ammenemêš” mentioned.

* * * *

(8.) 18. EREKHÖPHÈS, or URKHOÆUS, B'OUSIRIS (Diodor.). The ninth, if including B'ousiris I.

* * * *

(15.) 25. KONKHARÈS, KONKHARIS, or the KHAN KHÆRES¹; also called EREKHÖPHÈS, or Urkhoæus,

¹ The prefix Khan, Kan, or Kon, is probably analogous to the Persian title of ruler or governor, used also of the Tartar kings, and it may be compared with the Hebrew **הָנָגָן**, whence **הָנָגָן**, owner or lord, Isa. i. 3. We have it perhaps lingering in the name *Candacè*, queen of the Ethiopians. It was used by the Abyssinians also in the despotic sense of *rex mancipiorum* (Walton, *Prolegom.* xv. 2.) The name Chærêš (*Xaiphnys*) occurs separately from that prefix, in the sixth king of the second dynasty of Africanus, and repeatedly afterwards enters into combination; as in *Nepher-Kherêš*, *Men-Kherêš*, *Zeber-Kherêš*, *La-Kharêš*, *Nephel-Kherêš*. Each of these is thus in reality two names, one of which might sometimes be omitted. Hence the later *Kan Men-Kherêš* (or *Menêš-Khærêš*) might be known also without the former of the two names by the briefer designation of the *Kan-Kherêš*, and this earlier *Ken-Kherêš* thus became liable to be confounded with the *Kan Men-Cherêš*.

The syllable *Khan* or *Khen* is also found in combination with the name *Osiris*, proving it to be an Egyptian title;—*Xevoστης*, “the Khan-Osiris,” applied as an Egyptian name for the ivy, which was sacred to Bacchus or Osiris. From this application of it, *Khen* has come to be interpreted by some as if it were in

written in the Barbarous-Latin Extracts NECHEROCHEUS. He is reckoned by Eusebius the twenty-fifth from Mizraim; really, however, he is the fifteenth from Menès. And with this reign, according to Manetho's general scheme, terminate the 443 years which complete the twenty-fourth Canicular Cycle. Eusebius, in the Greek Sozomena of the first book of his "Chronica," says that, according to Manetho, his fifth year completed seven hundred years after Mizraim, the first colonizer of Egypt. The passage is given by Syncellus, and has been quoted above, Chapter V., page 144. Its substance is as follows: "Over the Egyptians, twenty-fifth in the succession, reigned KONKHARIS for five years. In the fifth year of Konkharis, the twenty-fifth king of Egypt, in the sixteenth dynasty which belonged to the past Canicular Cycle according to Manetho, there are completed from Mizraim, the first king and settler, seven hundred years of the twenty-five kings ²."

meaning equivalent to *φυτὸν*, *plant*; and Χερέψης equivalent to *φυτὸν ἡλίου*. See Valpy's edition of Jablonski's Glossary, in Steph. "Thesaur." p. ccxeviii. But it will be found that the derivation from the Coptic there given would confessedly require the words to be *altered* without authority to Σχενόσφις and Σχενέψης,—rather a violent change. I submit, therefore, that the association of the syllable to the name of Osiris may be rather taken to support the meaning already given. It is found in combination with the names of kings, and designates their princely office. If some sort of rose were called "the Queen Victoria," as a water lily is the "Victoria Regia," it would not show that the word queen meant *tree*, nor does the application of the name "King Charles" to a breed of dogs affect the true meaning of the word *king*. How then should the application of the name "Khan Osiris" to his sacred ivy affect the meaning of the word *Khan*?

² Sir George Cornewall Lewis ("Hist. Astr." p. 284, note) says, "It is agreed by modern critics that these words are not to

It may be observed that the interval from Menès to the Shepherd dynasty does not differ much from the interval from Nimrod to the death of Abraham, according to the Septuagint.

SHEPHERD DYNASTY IN EGYPT.

(16.) 26. SILITÈS or SALATIS, written SAÏTÈS by the Scholiast on Plato, and by the pseudo-Africanus :— qu. with an old form of the letter Sigma, read Σίλιτης, which may have come, by mistake or partial obliteration of the writing, for Φίλιτης or Φίλιτίων, the *Philistine* or *Palestinian*? Compare Herod. ii. 128, ποιμὴν Φίλιτίων, the “*Philistine Shepherd*,” with the designation ΗΥΚ-Σôs, “the *armed Shepherd*” (for so that name is really to be interpreted), and compare both with the condition of the Philistine Shepherd in the days of Abraham and Isaac. Josephus, following Manetho, has applied to these Shepherds the designation of Hyk-Σôs; and he tells us that Σôs in the Egyptian language meant “Shepherd,” but of the former syllable “Hyk” he gives from Manetho two alternative meanings, “king,” or “captive,” and he prefers the latter rendering. Jablonski, however, has successfully shown that Hyk means not “bound as a captive,” but “girt as a warrior,” that is, “armed;” or else “girt with the official robe as a king.” The name is also written by Josephus

be taken as proving the mention of the Canicular Cycle by Manetho!” But what then are they to be taken as proving? May critics combine to decide contrary to the evidence?

³ “Hyk et Hak Ægyptiorum sermone non dicitur *captivus*, aut *vinctus instar captivi*. Proprie vox illa significat *cingere* aut *se ipsum*, aut *alium*, *Levit.* viii. 7, 8, 13, *Lucae* xii. 35. Dicitur etiam de animalibus, quæ *cinguntur*, aut *insternuntur*, *Genes.* xxii. 3, *Numer.* xx. 21. Eadem voce significatur *se armare vel armis*

‘Τκουσσώς, (Hyk-oussôs) and the second part of this word suggests a name known in the Phœnician traditions, Ούσωος, Ousôus⁴.

In both the lists of the Dynasties and also by the Scholiast on Plato the Shepherd kings are called Phœnician strangers (Φοίνικες ξένοι βασιλεῖς) who took Memphis. The name of Phœnicians is applied also by Philo to the Amalekites⁵.

It is important to observe that Diodorus, or rather an Egyptian Oracle whose answer is recorded by him, applies the name of Allophyli (Αλλόφυλοι, the same with the Septuagint rendering of the name Philistines) to the Shepherds who had settled in Egypt; and he also names *Cadmus*, among the leaders of their departure, as having conducted a portion to Greece. Now, although, with the inaccuracy common to the heathen writers in speaking of the Jews, he confounds *them* with that earlier Shepherd race in Egypt, yet this testimony is not to be neglected, but placed in connexion with other evidence, all bearing in the same direction. See note E in the Appendix, extract from Diodor. xl.

Of this dynasty there are named four or six kings. The lists and the order of the kings vary; but the following are named after Siletês, BEON or ANÔN; APAKHNAS or PAKHNÂN; APOPHIS or APHOPHIS; IANIAS; ASSIS or ASETH; ARKHLÈS. But at most there were not more than six. The name Apophis, according

se cingere, Num. xxxi. 3, 5. Nam ut Pausanias monet: Τὸ ἐνδῦναι τὰ ὅπλα ἐκάλουν οἱ παλαιοὶ ζώσασθαι, Arma induere, veteres cingere dicebant. Et armatura ipsa hinc dicitur *Ephes.* vi. 13 (Æth. Vers.).” *Jablonski, Panth. Æg. prolegomena*, § LVII.

⁴ Philo, Bybl. ex Sanchoniath., ap. Euseb. “Præp. Evang.” i. 10, p. 35.

⁵ *Vita Moysis*, i. 39.

to Jablonski, signifies *the giant*, which may suggest a comparison with the Theban king Apappus rendered *μέγιστος* by Eratosthenes. But if the Shepherds were Philistines, we know that they had among them a race of giants historically celebrated; and their tribe was certainly at this period settled at least contiguously.

The geographical origin of the Philistines is obscure, though genealogically they were derived from Mizraim through Casluchim and Captor⁶, and may therefore be the race who, by their invasion and conquest of Egypt, substituted the Mizraite for the Aÿrian or Osirian dynasty⁷. They seem not to have been of the native tribes of Canaan, for they are called “foreigners,” “men of another tribe” (ἀλλότριοι, Heb xi. 34; Isa. i. 7, LXX. Comp. מִזְרָאִם, Isa. xxv. 2, 5, and ἀλλόφυλοι, LXX, *passim*), though Palestine eventually received their name. There is nothing adverse to their having been settled originally in the far East, and having thence migrated as nomads westward towards the seats of their kindred clans. Hindoo tradition is said to recognize such a migration of the powerful tribe of the Pali. In the “Chronicon Paschale” we learn further, on the authority of the learned Epiphanius, Bishop of Cyprus in the fifth century, and of others, that “Mizraim, migrating afterwards to the eastern parts, became the colonizer of Bactria, and gave the name of ‘Asōa of the Great

⁶ Gen. x. 15; Deut. ii. 23; Jer. xlvi. 4; Amos ix. 7. They seem to have been of the same race with the Cherethim, or Cretim, who peopled and gave name to Crete. Ezek. xxv. 16; Zeph. ii. 5. Bochart (“Phaleg.” iv. 31) would identify the Casluchim with the Colchians, but Herodotus indicates a different origin of that Egyptian colony.

⁷ Manetho, ap. Syncel. See above, p. 146.

Indies' to the interior, or remoter part of Persia,"—*Οὗτος Μεσραεὶμ ὁ Αἰγύπτιος μετέπειτα ἐπὶ τὰ ἀνατολικὰ μέρη οἰκήσας, οἰκήτωρ γίνεται Βάκτρων, τὴν ἐσωτέραν Περσίδος λέγει Ἀσοα τῶν μεγάλων Ἰνδῶν*⁸. Agreeably to this we shall find these nomad Indian, yet Mizraite, conquerors of Egypt described by Æschylus upon their Bactrian camels. The camel was not properly an Egyptian animal, nor is it at all depicted on the monuments. It was coming-in in the days of Abraham, but after the expulsion of the Shepherds is not named among the flocks and cattle or other property of the Egyptians, in the time of Joseph⁹.

If the Shepherd dynasty be, as I think it is, that which Æschylus alludes to in a passage of his *Supplices*, when speaking of the Nile and Egypt, the information which he has preserved is worthy of attention, and assigns a remote Indian or Indo-Bactrian origin to that nomad tribe.

*Ἰνδούς τ' ἀκούω νομάδας ἵπποβάμοσιν
εἶναι καμήλοις ἀστραβιζούσας, χθόνα
παρ' Αἴθιοψιν ἀστνγειτονομένους.*—l. 283.

Eusebius, with his varied learning, was not ignorant of the facts referred to in this passage, though he does not cite it. He mentions (but it is only slightly, and not quite in the right period of time) the *Aithiopes ab Indo fluvio*, ETHIOPIANS from the river Indus. His expression furnishes us with the fact that these Indian nomads were a kindred branch of the race of CUSH, or perhaps, in a wider sense, of the descendants of Ham, who had been formerly settled on the river Indus. *Αἴθιοπες ἀπὸ Ἰνδοῦ ποταμοῦ ἀναστάντες πρὸς τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ φέκησαν.* His

⁸ "Chron. Pasch." ed. Ducange, fol. 1688, p. 28.

⁹ Gen. xii. 16; xlvi. 17.

mention of them here is as settlers on the *borders* of Egypt, and therefore before their entrance and occupation of it ; which followed, however, as we find from *Æschylus*, and extended as far up as the borders of the Thebaid. They are represented by him not in the condition of captives, but with their proudly-mounted and caparisoned *riding camels*¹, occupying the land as far up as the borders of Ethiopia, that is, of the Thebaid : for Homer accounts Thebes a city of Ethiopia ; and the prophet Nahum (ch. iii. 8, 9) speaks of it as deriving its strength from “Ethiopia and Egypt.” And that this, and not the Arabian Ethiopia, was meant by *Æschylus*, the reader may satisfy himself, both from the general context, and by referring to the same poet’s kindred play of “Prometheus Vinctus” (lines 806—810), where he speaks of it as the country out of which the Nile flows.

The tradition of the settlement of these Indian Mizraimite nomads lingered, after their expulsion from Egypt, in the title borne by the country adjacent to the head of the Red Sea ; which, in a passage of the “Chronicon Paschale” (seemingly from Epiphanius, and perhaps ultimately referable to Eusebius), is called “Arsinoité of the Indian quarter².” The Arabian Ethiopia is also there distinguished from the Ethiopia here mentioned, which lies to the south of Egypt ; the former as the Ethiopia which

¹ So much seems implied in the word *ἱπποβάμοσι*, “equestrian.” The nature of the “camel’s furniture,” implied in the word *ἀστραβιζούσαις*, may be inferred from hence to be adapted to riding. Comp. Gen. xxxi. 17, 34.

² Καὶ τὴν Ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν ἀπὸ στόματος τοῦ κατὰ Ἀρσινοήν τῆς Ἰνδικῆς. “Chron. Pasch.” ed. Ducange, p. 31. The same is also found in the “Barbarous-Latin Extracts,” p. 62.

looks to the Indians, the latter as the Ethiopia from which the Nile flows ⁵.”

The comparison of the fragments of information from these various sources furnishes us with the following facts. The Shepherds are called Allophyli, a name customarily applied to the Philistines, but literally signifying “another tribe;” and of what neighbouring race were they another tribe ⁴? They came from a land which had been colonized with the posterity of Mizraim. Their arrival at least preceded the dynasty to which Danaus belonged, judging even from *Æschylus*, for he represents the fame of their former possession of Egypt as lingering in Greece previous to the time of the arrival of the daughters of Danaus there. But indeed they had come and gone; their first expulsion signalized the beginning of that great dynasty, in the midst of which Danaus lived. Their first appearance, to some extent, tallies in time with the arrival of the Philistines on the borders of Egypt; who were a tribe of the descendants of Mizraim, but not of the

⁴ Αἰθιοπία ἡ βλέπουσα κατὰ Ἰνδοὺς, καὶ ἐπέρα Αἰθιοπία ὅθεν ἐκπορεύεται ὁ τῶν Αἰθιόπων ποταμὸς ὁ καλούμενος Νεῦλος, *Ibid.* p. 29. The same is also found in the “Barbarous-Latin Extracts,” ap. Scalig. “Thesaur. Temp.” p. 61.

⁵ The existence of a third tribe of the same people is indicated in the mention—quoted by Diodorus from the historian Euemerus, the friend of King Cassander—of a temple of Jupiter, or Belus, of the three tribes, *ἱερὸν Διὸς τριφυλαίου*, which he had seen in the island Pankhaia in the Indian Ocean (Ceylon?), and which had been erected there by a great conqueror, not improbably Sesostris. A genealogy was there given of the Curetæ, or Curetes (Cherethim, or Cretim?), as one of the tribes; from a colony of whom, being a branch of the same race with the Philistines, the island of Crete received its name. Diodor. “Fragm.” I., ex. lib. vi. Opp. ed. Wesseling, fol. Amst. 1746, vol. ii. p. 633. Comp. 1 Sam. xxx. 14, 16; Ezek. xxv. 16; Zeph. ii. 5.

same tribe with the native Egyptians, and were hence called the *Allophyli*, “the people of the other tribe.” They were probably the same people with the Philistines, or else a kindred tribe of that people, of which the *Amalekites* and the *Anakims* seem also to have been branches; in connexion with which it may be mentioned, that the Arabian historians tell us that the *Amalekites* once conquered Egypt, and possessed the throne of that country for several generations. So Stackhouse states in his “History of the Bible” (Book iv. ch. 3), though he does not cite his authorities more specially, and I have not referred to them. But the Arabian tradition seems to have represented the *Philistines* and *Amalekites* as kindred tribes, since Eutychius, Patriarch of Alexandria, himself an Arabian writer under the Khalifs in the ninth century, represents these two tribes as united in the attack upon Israel in the Wilderness:—“Porro in deserto oppugnarunt illos *Amelekitæ et Philistæi.*” *Eutych. Annal.* p. 104, *interpr. E. Pocock.* It may be added that there are not wanting some correspondences of name near the sources of the Indus. One of its tributaries in Cabul, a little to the south of Bactria, bore the name of the *Khoes*. The mountain range to the north of it was called the *Indian Koosh*; and this may not be, as some have supposed, a corruption of the name Indian Caucasus, which it received from the army of Alexander. Further north in Sogdiana, there was a town called *Gaza*, one of the seven which formed a league against the Macedonians⁵, furnishing a singular coincidence with the name of the Philistine capital. There is also said to be a Hindoo record or tradition, recognizing the migration of a large body

⁵ Arrowsmith, “Ancient Geography” and *Atlas*.

of the Pali, who extensively ruled in India, and their conquest of a country which Captain Wilford, in the third volume of the "Asiatic Researches," elaborately argued to be Egypt.

As regards the names of the other kings of this Shepherd dynasty, ΑΡΑΚΗΝÂS, or ΠΑΚΗΝÂN, may be compared with the name of the town *Tah-panhêš*, "the place of Pakhnâs," for the Egyptian prefix *Ta* or *Tha*, as Jablonski states, means "place" (as it were Pakhnopolis) : which is mentioned Jer. ii. 16 ; xlivi. 7, 8 ; xliv. 1 ; called *Hanes*, Isa. xxx. 4, and *Tephaphnehes*, Ezek. xxx. 18, afterwards contracted into Taphnis and Daphne ; and from which the wife of Pharaoh Shishak received her name, 1 Kings xi. 19.

The name of BEON, ΒÆON, BNÔN⁶, or ANON, I have found no clue to explain ; but the change from the one form to the other may be accounted for by the fact that he stands second on the list, immediately following Silitêš. Hence the letter B, which answers to the numeral mark of 2, has either been added to the name by mistake, or, if it was originally part of it, has been abstracted through the converse of the same mistake. The remaining letters *Aiων* or *Aνων* are not very dissimilar. And as some ancient forms of the Greek Alpha and Delta are not unlike, it is not impossible that this may be the same name which appears in the Babylonian records as the Shepherd *Δaώς*, or *Δάων*. See the Table above, p. 164. ΑΡΚΗLÈS, who is placed by some in this dynasty, is more likely a contemporary Theban king ; and we are informed, indeed, that Theban kings reigned in the period of the Shepherds 151 years. 'Ομοῦ ποιμένες καὶ οἱ Θηβαῖοι ἐβασίλευσαν ἔτη ρνα'. (See the list of Manetho's Dynasties, so called, ascribed to Africanus, 17th Dyn. Scalig. "Thesaur. Temp."

⁶ Βνῶν, so written by the Scholiast on Plato.

p. 352.) This might explain the insertion of Arkhlēs by some, and omission of him by others. The name “Arkhlēs” (*Ἀρχλῆς*) seems to me to present the root of the name Hercules (*Ἡρακλῆς*), as it were Ἡρκαλή, “the expeditionary,” perhaps the very word which is rendered in the “Excerpta Barbara” STOLIARCHUS¹. If so, his position in this period may possibly illustrate what Herodotus says (lib. ii. 43) about the Egyptians reckoning first *eight* gods, and then *twelve*; and that *Hercules was one of the twelve*. For their gods were recognized by the Egyptian priests as having been men; and the succession of the numbers, first eight and then twelve, suggests the reckoning of the generations by Diodorus first eight and then twelve. In this view of it, as seven of the twelve were numbered to the close of the reign of Konkharēs, five Theban kings remain to be counted as contemporary with the Shepherds, and prior to Amōsis, whose expulsion of the Shepherds marked a new epoch. Whatever may be thought of the correspondence of the above allusion of Herodotus, it appears that the reckoning of Diodorus requires this computation of five native kings contemporary with the Shepherds. For after Urchoæus, the eighth king, he counts twelve generations down to and preceding Moeris, then seven, and then Sesostris following them as an eighth. Now, counting the generations as above, there are seven from Urchoæus to Konkharēs: five more will complete the twelve down to and preceding Amōsis. This last king appears thus to correspond

¹ “ORON STOLIARCHUM,” “ORUS the STOLIARCH,” *Excerpta Barbara, ap. Scalig. Thesaur. Temp.* p. 74.—Compare the word στόλαρχος, commander of an expedition, more especially of a naval one, but not exclusively so, since στόλος is used for either.

with the Moeris or Myris of Diodorus, twenty-first in the succession. The numbers seem to have been differently counted by different persons; for by some the period of the Shepherd dynasty has been simply thrown out of view, or passed over as not belonging to the reckoning of the native kings; or taken only as equivalent to the one native king whom they dethroned. On this principle Amôsis would immediately follow Silitê in the list: and accordingly he stands, under the name Ousê, as the seventeenth from Menê; while again on that principle, *reckoning from Mizraim*, Silitê is the twenty-sixth, and Amôsis would be twenty-seventh. Much confusion was introduced by these two different ways of counting respectively from Mizraim and from Menê; but Amôsis is in truth the same with Ousê; and the latter name (perhaps only a clipped or abbreviated form of the same) is found in combination with Marê, Ousimarê; so that hence there may be no improbability that he had also the designation of Marê, Moeris, or Myris, as Diodorus gives it, for the associations of names are not casual, but run in families. He appears also to be the same with Moscheris, or Amôsis Khærê, the seventeenth in the list of Eratosthenes⁸.

These things stand connected with the reign of Amôsis, which we have not yet come to; but they are necessary to be noticed here because they also are intimately connected with the duration of the Shepherd dynasty. Roughly estimated, five generations of Theban kings might be taken as equivalent to 150 years. And they are thus estimated in the words quoted above (*ρνα'*); but in Manetho's general scheme, the duration of the dynasty is stated at forty years more than this, namely 190 years; at least he

⁸ See Appendix, Note A.

there assigns 190 years to the dynasty preceding the eighteenth, whether exclusively to the Shepherd dynasty, or rather to the Theban contemporary with it. His general preference is to count by native dynasties. His reckoning, however, had obviously varied in different places and in different copies of his works, by the inclusion or exclusion of a reign or two, or in some other way. Scaliger, indeed, expressly informs us that a dynasty which Eusebius numbers the sixteenth, but which seems rather to be the Theban dynasty contemporary with the Shepherds, was stated in some copies at a duration of 160 years, in others 190^o. It is worthy of remark that the first occasion on which the Philistine Shepherds are mentioned as having been met with by Abraham in Palestine, was the year before the birth of Isaac, when the bloom of her meridian beauty had just been restored to Sarah; and, as will afterwards appear, there are just 160 years from the birth of Isaac to the expulsion of the Shepherds by Amôsis. It may also be worthy of remark, that 190 years, counted back from their expulsion by Amôsis, carry up to a date about two years after Abraham's departure with Terah, his father, from Ur of the Chaldees, and arrival at Haran. We shall afterwards show¹ that political events had occurred in the land of the Chaldees, and in other central parts of Asia about that time, which account for a wave of pastoral emigration rolling westward, and partially reaching Egypt, not improbably within two years, while Abraham remained at Haran. But

^o Euseb. "Chron." 1, ap. Scalig. *Thesaur. Temp.* p. 18, and Euseb. "Chron. Can." Lat. sub. init., *Ibid.* p. 57. Syncel. "Chronogr." p. 96. See the passage cited above, Chap. III. p. 83, note, with remarks there.

¹ Below, Chap. XI.

they entered peacefully for refuge. Again, there is nothing improbable in the fact that the Philistine Shepherds began to make a gradual entrance into Egypt the year after Abraham first met with them in Palestine. The two numbers 190 and 160 are thus accounted for. It is recorded that the first entrance of the Shepherds into Egypt was peaceful; their encroachment gradual. Their forcible seizure and tenure of the sovereignty of Lower Egypt did not last nearly 160 years. Eusebius in his "Chronicus Canon," according to Jerome, makes it 103: it was strictly 88. The Shepherds of the Seventeenth Dynasty² held power in Lower Egypt contemporaneously with the Thebans of the Sixteenth in the upper country, as we are told: and this interlacing of their periods prevents us from so perfectly extricating the details of the measured time. The years of the Shepherd kings, six in number in the list of them now found in the text of Josephus, do not accord; but the duration of the four Shepherd kings in that list which passes under the name of Eusebius, if modified by comparison with Josephus (c. Apion. i. 14), may be reconcilable with the general measure of the time from the entrance of the Philistine tribe into Palestine³. In

² The Scholiast on the *Timaeus* of Plato (Opp. ed. Valpy, vol. ix., Schol. p. 90) counts the Shepherd dynasty the seventeenth. As to the date of the Scholiast himself, as he cites Proclus, who died A.D. 485, he probably lived between that time and the edict of Justinian, which imposed silence on the schools of Athens forty-four years afterwards. *Gibbon, Rom. Emp.*

³ Σατῆς ἔτη ὥ	19
⁴ Ανῶν „ μύ (read μδ')	44
⁵ Αφωφίς „ ὥ (read ξδ')	64
⁶ Ανχῆς „ λ' (read Απαχνᾶς, λς')	36

the measurement of the periods in different places, even of the same authors, there is a variation within approximate limits, as if the dates and measurements might have been taken at different times, in reference to different stages of the events. It seems also impossible to acquit Manetho of wavering and uncertainty in his statements, as regards the Shepherd period of the history. We have not, indeed, the details of his history sufficiently to compare with his general scheme; nor can we be surprised that, in the absence of these, we are unable to obtain from that general scheme more than the most general results. But there is considerable indication of confusion and uncertainty having existed in the mind of Manetho between the earlier Shepherds and the Israelites; and this tendency may have been increased by the fact of a renewed invasion of Egypt by the Philistine Amalekite Shepherds having occurred in the minority of Sesostris, during part of the time when the Israelites were in Egypt. Thus we find Josephus (c. Apion. i. 26, ii. 2) affirming Manetho to have said that the *Jews* (but he speaks here manifestly by confusion of the earlier Shepherds) departed out of Egypt in the reign of Tethmôsis; and he makes a further confusion apparently of the date of the *expulsion* with the date of the *entrance* of these earlier Shepherds, when he says it was three hundred and ninety-three years before Danaus fled to Argos. The date here indicated must be the beginning of the violent domination of the Shepherds, not their expulsion, unless Manetho had reference to a previous attempt at expulsion, short-lived, and which only provoked their more vengeful and destructive return; for the 393 years, together with the reigns of Sesostris I. and II. (59 + 66 years),

are *expressly given*, to make up the sum of 518 years; which, it may be observed in the sixteenth of the dynastic lists ascribed to Africanus, are assigned as the duration of the dominion or occupancy of the Shepherds. The same computation may seem to be at the root of the statement, which assigns the duration of 511 years to their reign; the difference of the two implying only an interval of seven years besides, as having broken the continuity of the time in the 518 years of Shepherd occupancy. But if the 511 and the 518 years are to be taken as terminating at the same date, it will be found that they do not allow so long a period as 190 or 160 years for the violent Shepherd occupation of Egypt, but only 88 down to their expulsion by Amôsis, because the 518 years measure down to the death of Sesostris II., and the Exodus of Israel under his successor, which immediately followed.

In regard to these long measurements, we shall have some remarks to offer afterwards, when other evidence is before us. It will be found that they include the time of the Israelites in Egypt, and go distinctly towards proving the full period of four hundred years for the sojourning of Israel in Egypt, onward to the Exodus under Moses (compare Gen. xv. 13; Exod. xii. 40; Acts vii. 6; Gal. iii. 17). With that question, or with Josephus's unsettled view of it ("Antiq." ii. 15, contrary to "Antiq." ii. 9), we are not at present concerned. There seems, indeed, no sufficient reason to take the passage of the Epistle to the Galatians (ch. iii.) otherwise than in agreement with Exod. xii. 40. But the object before us is to ascertain as far as possible what Manetho's chronology really was, not whether it was right. The point, however, is worthy to be remembered, and we shall afterwards recur to it.

We have seen from the fragments of Chaldean history, transmitted by Abydenus and Apollodorus after Berosus, that the Shepherd dynasty established itself at Babylon, and maintained its ground there for some reigns later than the date of its expulsion from Egypt by Amōsis. The wave, in short, rolled, as has been shown, from the far north-east, even from Bactria. During the continuance of the dynasty at Babylon, four expeditions, naval and military, whether national or piratical, were directed against it, by the way of the Persian Gulf; the leaders of which, in the terrors of the people, and the wonder-loving traditions of their children, were regarded as strange amphibious creatures, on land by day, retiring to the sea at night. Thus Abydenus, after mentioning, among the sovereigns of Babylon, Daōs, the Shepherd, adds these words,—*ἔφ' οὐδ' δύ διφυεῖς εἰς γῆν ἐκ θαλάσσης ἀνέδυσαν, ὃν τὰ δύνοματα ταῦτα, Εὐέδωκος, Ἐνεύγαμος, Ἐνάβουλος, Ἀνήμεντος*⁴. The appellation of διφυῆς is found applied also to Cecrops, and some others. These four remarkable invasions seem probably to indicate that a succession of Shepherd sovereigns, or at least more than a single reign, is included under the name of Daōs the Shepherd, at Babylon. If we compare the name Daōs or Daōn with Philistine names, it may suggest “Dagon,” with a different spelling only, assuming the *g* to have originally represented a letter sometimes so pronounced, sometimes quiescent, such as *y* in Hebrew.

Of the other kings who are mentioned in this Shepherd dynasty, IANIAS I suspect to be not a king at all, but the celebrated chief magician who is mentioned together with Jambres; and if so, he belongs to the period of the powerful kings of the

⁴ Euseb. “Chron.” i. Gr. p. 5, ap. Scalig. *Thesaur. Temp.*

eighteenth dynasty, during the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt, and at the close of it. The fact that so many writers have confounded the Shepherd dynasty with the Israelites, makes it credible that a person, remarkable in the period of the latter, might be erroneously inserted in the period of the former. And Ianias is only found in one of the lists, namely, that of Josephus, by whom that confusion of the Shepherds with the Israelites was certainly fallen into. Assis and ASETH may be Theban kings; the former, like Ousê, a clipped form or portion of the same name with Amôsis, Amâsis, Amesses, and Rhamesses: the other identical or at least liable to be confounded with Sethôs, only with prefix. It is said of Aseth by Eusebius, that in his reign the calf was deified and called Apis. The worship of the calf seems unlikely to have been introduced by Shepherds; and if it had been introduced by men who were so had in abomination by the Egyptians, we might have expected it to have been expelled along with them. Moreover, if the Shepherds were of the same people with the Philistines, we do not seem to find that worship existing among them. Again, compare also what is said as to this worship in the reign of Koös, Katé-Khôs, or Keni-Khôs (Dyn. 2.), that “Apis and Mnevis, and also the Mendesian goat, were recognized as gods in *his* reign:” ὅτε καὶ ὁ Ἀπις, καὶ ὁ Μνεῦις, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ Μενδήσιος τράγος, θεοὶ ἐνομίσθησαν⁵. The worship of Apis was connected with the belief of the transmigration of souls, especially of Osiris⁶. Aseth, whom Eusebius places thirty-second from Mizraim, is also said to have added to the year the five days

⁵ Vid. ap. Scalig. “Thesaur. Temp.” Gr., pp. 14 and 341.

⁶ Diodor. i. 85.

called the *Epagomenæ*; which are over the round number of the 360 days, at which the year had previously been estimated. (Euseb. "Chron." i., Scalig. "Thesaur. Temp." p. 23.) This was the act of a Sophi or Philosopher,—not, we should suppose, of a calf-worshipper, were it not for the attested connexion of that worship with the Oriental philosophical doctrine of the metempsychosis. It calls to mind, not obscurely, the golden circle divided into 365 equal parts, to represent the days of the year, which was in the tomb of Osymandyas, also called Memnon and Sesostris, or Sethōsis, and Sethōs, as by Josephus. It agrees also with what an ancient Scholiast tells us of the oath taken by the kings, *in the temple of Apis*, to maintain unaltered the year of 365 days; in which a connexion of the worship of Apis, with the introduction of the five days called Epagomenæ, appears very strikingly. The passage of the Scholiast referred to, descriptive of the inauguration of their kings, which Diodorus tells us took place in the temple of Apis⁷, is given by Jablonski as follows. "In templo Ægypti Memphi, mos fuit solio regio decorari reges, satis religiose tunicati: et tauro, quem Apim appellant, jugum portare fas erat, . . . et per vicum unum duci. Deducitur autem a sacerdote Isidis, in locum qui nominatur Adytes, et jure-jurando adigitur, neque mensem, neque diem intercalandum, quem in festum diem immutarent, sed ccclxv dies peracturos, sicut institutum est ab antiquis⁸."

The Scholiast on Plato informs us that the intro-

⁷ In H. Valesii "Excerptis," p. 354, cited by Jablonski.

⁸ "Scholiastes Germanici in Aratea," p. 120, edit. Sant-Andr. de A. 1583, cited by Jablonski, "Panth. Ægypt." lib. iv. c. 2, p. 210. Apis seems here to be called "Ægyptus."

duction of the year of 365 days was ascribed by Manetho to the first king of the Shepherd dynasty, Saïtēs. But in his statement it is mixed up with the conversion of the lunar month into a calendar month of thirty days, by the addition of twelve hours to every month, giving in the first instance twelve months of thirty days each, in all 360 days. We know that a year of that measure was in use for some time. These therefore are two very different stages of progress, which appear to be here run together into one⁹. This mistake may have been gone into by Manetho, as the Scholiast asserts; and if so, it agrees with his having in his general scheme placed the commencement of the Canicular Cycle at the beginning of the seventeenth dynasty, and may furnish a clue to unravel some inconsistency and perplexity in his treatment of the history and chronology to the extent to which they may be dependent on it. Probably both are in some degree the result of his having fallen into some confusion of the Israelites with the earlier Shepherds.

As however the determination of the date of the introduction of the Egyptian year of 365 days, together with the Canicular Cycle, is of great importance to chronology, and requires a special treatment, depending much upon simple numerical considerations and facts of nature, it is desirable to assign it a distinct Chapter.

⁹ Ο δὲ Σαΐτης προσέθηκε τῷ μηνὶ ὥρας υφ', ὡς εἶναι ἡμερῶν λ' καὶ τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ ἡμέρας σ' (ε'?), καὶ γέγονεν ἡμερῶν τέξε. Schol. "in Plat. Timaeum," p. 91, Plat. Opp., ed. Valpy, vol. ix.

CHAPTER VIII.

CALCULATION OF THE DATE OF THE LEGALIZED INTRODUCTION OF THE EGYPTIAN YEAR OF 365 DAYS, TOGETHER WITH ITS SOTHIC CYCLE, BY THE RETROGRESSION OF THE THOTH, WITH COLATERAL EVIDENCE; AFFORDING AN APPROXIMATE DEMONSTRATION OF THE DATE OF THE GOLDEN CIRCLE OF OSYMANDYAS OR SESOSTRIS.

THE date of the legalized introduction of the year of 365 days, which is of primary importance to historical chronology, admits of being calculated; but, though the principles on which this may be done have been long ago pointed out, there has been failure hitherto in their application, owing to certain demonstrable errors in the *data* which have been conventionally admitted. Sir Isaac Newton has suggested that as the Golden Circle in the tomb of Osymandyas was divided into 365 days, each of the divisions also having the heliacal risings and settings of the stars on that day noted upon it, it may be concluded thence that it was that king, also called Amenophis and Memnon, who established this year, fixing the beginning of it to one of the four cardinal points. The Golden Circle was carried away by Cambyses, and its direct evidence as to the position of the commencing Thoth, or first day of the first month of the moving Egyptian year, is thus lost.

The year of 365 days, with its cycle of revolution, owed its scientific origin to Thoth or Hermes, and had been in use among the learned and scientific for a short time before the accession of the king, in whose tomb, prepared by himself in his lifetime, the Golden Circle was placed ; but its appropriation as a monument of this king certainly indicates that it was from him that it received its legal sanction and public establishment. And at the time when the year was thus publicly sanctioned and instituted by authority it is reasonable to assume that the first day of the first month, called Thoth after the scientific author of that new reckoning, must have been placed in coincidence with one of the equinoxes or one of the solstices.

Now it was computed by Sir Isaac Newton that the Thoth corresponded to the vernal equinox in the year B.C. 884, a hundred and thirty-seven years before the era of Nabonassar ; which is assuming that era to have commenced on the 26th of February (Julian time) B.C. 747, "thirty-three days and five hours before the vernal equinox." On this ground partly, Sir Isaac chose the year B.C. 884 for the date of the death of Osymandyas, otherwise called Memnon or Amenophis¹ ; but in so doing he shortened the chronology beyond what any one would defend. There is no special reason why we should fix upon the vernal rather than the autumnal equinox ; and indeed Sir Isaac only says that "they *might* place the beginning of this new year upon the vernal equinox." If, on the other hand, we take the autumnal equinox (and we know historically that the civil year, which the Israelites used in Egypt, and no doubt in common

¹ Sir I. Newton, "Chron." p. 31, and pp. 80, 81. The reader may here refer to Chap. II., above, pp. 45—48, No. VI. VII. VIII.

with the natives, began in the *autumn*²; Exod. xxiii. 16, xii. 2, Levit. xxiii. 34), then, still calculating back, the Thoth would be theoretically in correspondence with the autumnal equinox, say half a Canicular Cycle (730 years) earlier, which would bring it to about B.C. 1614: but this is *supposing*, as before, that the date above assumed for the era of Nabonassar was correct. I have reason to think that it is *not* correct, but has been assumed on insufficient grounds, and that the date to which the calculation ought to conduct was the 20th, not the 26th of February, B.C. 747, the exact era having apparently been fixed by the Alexandrian Astronomers by calculating back from the great eclipse of 28th May, B.C. 585, nine measures of the Saros or Chaldean Cycle of eclipses. This gives the 20th of February, B.C. 747, Julian time, which would be thirty-nine days and twelve hours before the vernal equinox.

When I first arrived at this discovery by means of the Chaldean Cycle of eclipses³, I did not at once perceive to the full extent its extreme value, nor the important and decisive consequences involved in it to remoter chronology. I may therefore be permitted briefly to refer to the subject, because the difference of six days and a few hours here gives rise to a considerable difference in the number of years to be computed back from that date; for every one of those days makes the difference of a quadrennial period in counting backwards, since it affects to that extent the time when the Thoth of the Egyptian year coincided with the vernal equinox.

² The Nile's inundation is said to be at its height at the autumnal equinox, which might afford a reason among others for taking the commencement of the year at first from that point.

³ "Isaiah's Testimony for Jesus," *Appendix*, pp. 503—505, 604—606, and "Shadow on the Sundial," p. 5.

Now, as far as I am aware, there is no ground for the date, as regards *the day of month*, which has passed current for the commencing era of Nabonassar except a statement of Censorinus, according to which the 984th annual recurrence of the Thoth or opening day of the first month of that era fell upon the seventh day before the Kalends of July (that is the 25th of June) in the year of the Consulship of Ulpius and Pontianus, in which he was writing (A.D. 238). Counting back thence for the Egyptian year the omitted intercalary days of the Julian year, which in the space of 984 years would amount to 246, we are brought to the 26th of February, thus:—

Of June	(remaining) 5 days.
„ July	31 „
„ August	31 „
„ September	30 „
„ October	31 „
„ November	30 „
„ December	31 „
„ January	31 „
„ February	26 „

246

But Censorinus counted, for the century preceding his own, twenty-six intercalary days, instead of twenty-five, as there would be according to the Julian year. This shows that he was working with other measures of the year besides the Julian and the Egyptian, and in fact that he was counting by the sidereal year. The Astronomer Ptolemy also is known to have computed the grand revolution of the Egyptian year not by comparison with the Julian year, but by the solar year, and according to a measure of it very nearly in agreement with that of Hipparchus, but

erring a little further from the truth; for he took the cycle of the grand revolution of the Egyptian year as equivalent to 1476 of those solar years⁴, which would be the case if the solar year were assumed to consist of 365 days, 5 hours, 56 minutes, 5 seconds⁵. Clearly therefore, on the showing both of Censorinus and of Ptolemy, it was a sufficiently palpable error to count back the commencing date of the era of Nabonassar by the intercalary days of the *Julian* year.

The Julian year is nearly in the mean between the solar year and the sidereal. In the calculation of the solar year in the Gregorian calendar, we omit one of the quadrennial intercalations (in other words, one leap year) in the century, three centuries out of four. For the calculation of the sidereal year, on the contrary, it would be necessary to insert one *more* intercalary day in the century, in two centuries out of three. A century of solar years has ordinarily only twenty-four intercalary days; a

⁴ Τὰς μέντοι ἀπὸ τῆς τελευτῆς Ἀλεξανδρου ψηφοφορίας τῶν ἀστέρων διαντὸς φιλόσοφος [Πτολεμαῖος] ἐν προχείροις κανόσιν, ανος ἐπῶν περιόδων, ἵτοι ἀποκαταστάσει Αἰγυπτιακοῦ ἐνὸς ἔτους ἔξεθετο. Syncel. "Chronogr." ed. Dindorf, vol. i. p. 389.

⁵ Hipparchus's measure of the solar year is stated to have been 365d. 5h. 55m. 12s., which is 53 seconds shorter than Ptolemy's, and so much nearer to the truth. Consistently with his error in elongating the year of Hipparchus, already too long, Ptolemy diminished the quantity which Hipparchus had assigned for the annual recession of the equinoctial points, though already estimated too low. For Hipparchus had made it one degree in seventy-five years, but Ptolemy reduced it to one degree in ninety years. Astronomy was retrograding in these practical points, as it had also prodigiously retrograded in the theory of the solar system from the view of it received and obscurely taught by Pythagoras, and revived after dreary ages of darkness by Copernicus.

century of sidereal years would ordinarily have twenty-six. The respective measures of the several years are as follows :—

The Solar year according to Newton,	365 days, 5 hours, 48 min., 57 sec. ⁸
The Sidereal according to Ferguson,	365 " 6 " 9 " 14½ "
The Julian year	365 " 6 " — " — "
The Egyptian year	365 " — " — " — "

It appears to me then that, as in his computation Censorinus was dealing with a question ostensibly connected with the rising of the star Sothis, he took the sidereal, not the Julian, year to compare with the Egyptian, and consequently assigned twenty-six intercalary days to the century, as has been mentioned. Now in calculating back, the 26th of February by the sidereal year would correspond not to the 26th but the 20th of February Julian time ; for in the space of 984 Egyptian years, the sum of 983

* According to Lacaille, 365d. 5h. 48m. 49s. "Encycl. Brit.," edit. vii., Art. "Astron." vol. iii. p. 725. In the same article, both in the seventh and eighth editions, the measure of the year is given 365d. 5h. 48m. 49½s. According to Dr. Colenso's statement, the odd number of seconds is 51½ ; according to Lalande and Bailly, 45 or 43 seconds ; according to Norisius, 48 seconds (for the three last, see Clinton, "Fasti Hellen." iii. 567). Mr. Denison, in his little popular work on Astronomy, tells us that the English astronomers have now settled the year to be 365d. 5h. 48m. 47½s. In the same place he gives the sidereal year 365.2563 days. Hansen gives the solar or tropical year 365d. 5h. 48m. 46.15s. The tropical year, being affected by the precession of the equinoxes, is subject to an inequality, and, according to the theory of Lagrange, is shorter at the present time by 40.5 seconds than it was B.C. 3102 ("Encycl. Brit.," edit. vii., *Astron.*). A lower estimate of this variation in the length of the year was formed by Laplace, according to which it is now not 9 or 10 seconds (as Lagrange), but about 4.2 seconds shorter than about the time of Hipparchus. It may be prudent to consider these last conclusions as still awaiting confirmation from experience.

sidereal years would exceed the sum of so many Julian by six days, seven hours, twenty-four minutes, thirty-three and a half seconds: and the date by the sidereal year would be carried so much further back.

We can scarcely too highly appreciate the singular value of the fact thus brought to light respecting the computation of Censorinus, and the era of Nabonassar. Manifestly since the Julian year is in the mean between the solar and sidereal, and its difference from the solar is even greater than from the sidereal, the same accuracy of observation which detected the latter cannot be supposed to have overlooked the former. The precise measure of the solar year, as we now have it, might not have been reached. The Julian year was taken as very nearly the exact mean between the two years; estimating the *defect* of the solar year as compared with the Julian about equal to the *excess* of the sidereal. The fact that that allowance of six days is the difference between the date of the era of Nabonassar as found by the *Saros* or cycle of eclipses—the 20th February (*Julian*)—and the date 26th February, which in modern times has been calculated for it by the omitted intercalary days of the *Julian* year, is thus explained; and it indicates what it was which constituted the reign of Nabonassar an era to the astronomers. It was the recognition of the divergence of the solar and the sidereal year, on the one side and on the other respectively, from the mean measure of $365\frac{1}{4}$ days, which is adopted in the Julian year, but which many ages before Julius Caesar was made the basis of the Canicular Cycle. Apart from this the era of Nabonassar would have been to the astronomers no era at all, but simply a continuation of the old Egyptian year and cycle. And yet it was chiefly, nay

exclusively, the *astronomers* who accounted it an era⁷. The Egyptian years were continued in it, at the same measure as before, namely 365 days each; but the truer proportionate value of these years in comparison with the solar and sidereal years had come to be understood. With the Julian year, as such, that era had nothing to do; though it had to do with the Canicular Cycle, which had probably been directly instrumental to the discovery of the divergence of the two years in the currency of its long period. In their calculations this divergence would be allowed for after the era of its discovery, which is assigned by the astronomers of Alexandria to the reign of Nabonassar. In corroboration of this view, we shall presently refer to an incidental statement of the late Professor Robison of the University of Edinburgh, a man of the highest scientific and literary attainments; but it is necessary at present, for the sake of preserving the connexion of the train of thought, to assume it as granted that it is as has been stated.

Taking then these facts into account, and placing the Thoth of the era of Nabonassar as it was really calculated by the Alexandrian philosophers, on the 20th of February (Julian time) B.C. 747, which is

⁷ "Nunquam enim \mathbb{A} gyptii annos suos populares a Thoth Nabonassari numerarunt: sed soli astrologi \mathbb{A} gyptii ea epocha usi sunt, propter Chaldaeos, qui longissimi temporis observationes suas ab initio Nabonassari repetebant. . . . Omnino scias epocham Nabonassari nunquam in usum popularem \mathbb{A} gyptiis receptam fuisse quum Nabonassar nunquam ipsis imperaverit sed tantum ab astronomis usurpatum fuisse ut eorum $\psi\eta\phi\phi\sigma\pi\alpha$ cum Chaldaica conveniret." *Scalig. Canon. Isagog.* lib. iii. p. 290, *in fine Thesaur. Temp.* It may be added, however, that the era of Nabonassar is not actually found used by any except *Egyptian* Astronomers, and that the year used in it is the Egyptian year.

thirty-nine days and nineteen hours before the vernal equinox; and reckoning back thence by the retrogression of the Egyptian year as compared with the *solar*, the date at which the Egyptian Thoth corresponded with the vernal equinox would be B.C. 911; and, reckoning still further back half a Canicular Cycle, the date at which it corresponded nominally with the autumnal equinox would be estimated about B.C. 1641, instead of the figures formerly obtained. There is an error involved in this, besides the error of the cycle; because it is assuming that the equinoxes bisect the year, which they do not exactly. But I am desirous to lead my reader on by those steps of approximation, which enable us to take up at each step the ancient computation which seems to have been based on it. To count back half a Canicular Cycle from the vernal equinox B.C. 911, when the Thoth of the Egyptian year was understood to be in accordance with that equinox, was a natural and probable reckoning for the ancients generally back to the date of its coinciding with the autumnal equinox. The unequal division of the year by the equinoxes was less generally known then than now; and though in the course of the year, the sun is $7\frac{2}{3}$ days longer in the northern hemisphere than in the southern, yet even now this inequality is not known or adverted to by the great majority of people. The most natural computation then was half a Canicular Cycle back from B.C. 911, which conducts to B.C. 1641, as has been stated. Now it is worthy of remark that the year last named is the year preceding that in which the Septuagint, according to Mr. Cunningham, places God's appearance to Moses in the burning bush; and consequently, on this reckoning, it was the last year of the Egyptian king whose

death is recorded in the second chapter of Exodus. This may be considered as indicating that in the judgment of the translators that king was Osymandyas, and the same with Sesostris the Great. But if, in the adapting of their chronology, these translators computed in this instance from the Egyptian year as compared with the Canicular Cycle, on the same principle by which we have now arrived at the same date as the time of the legal and public institution of the year of 365 days, then manifestly it is open to the question whether the date so arrived at be that of the *death* of Osymandyas, and not much rather of his triumphant return after his conquests; or else, before his expeditions, the date of his public authorization of the reform of the calendar; or even, as some might take it, the date of his birth, fixed upon as a landmark of time by the distinguished contemporary philosopher Thoth or Hermes, who first introduced the year of that measure, and has given his name to its commencement. If any of these be the case, then the Septuagint translators have doubtless erred in placing the death of Sesostris too far back: for the life of Sesostris spanned a whole century, and Thoth was probably his senior, perhaps his guardian and tutor. Still more would the Septuagint be in error as to the date of the Exodus, if there was another long reign, which intervened between the death of Sesostris the Great and the date of the Exodus of Israel; and this according to Manetho distinctly appears to have been the fact. Thus these translators have apparently confounded Sesostris I. and Sesostris II., as one; a mistake which was certainly committed by some others. Manetho's computation, we shall find, affords a means of comparison between the Septuagint

and Hebrew dates; and it tends to bring the death of Sesostris II. considerably nearer to the Hebrew date of the Exodus. Plainly the date of the golden circle, and the year as represented on it, ought not to be considered as corresponding to the *death* of Sesostris the Great, for if the Thoth of the Egyptian year had exactly corresponded with the autumnal equinox at the date of his death, then it would not correspond with the equinox at the time when he may be supposed to have introduced the year. The use of that year must have been introduced therefore in some previous reign, when it quadrated with one of the cardinal points, and if so we must go back till its commencement quadrates with the winter solstice, which, reckoning roughly by the Canicular Cycle, would be B.C. 2006. But in this case the appropriateness of the Golden Circle of the year to be the monument of Osymandyas would entirely disappear. That is an alternative not to be chosen.

We have an obscure statement preserved to us by Clement of Alexandria, which, if it be derived ultimately from Manetho, may be understood, by comparison with the statements from that author furnished by Josephus, to mean that the Sothic or Canicular Cycle was introduced before the time of Moses' leaving Egypt, in whose days it was in use; but three hundred and forty-five years later than the previous exodus in the time of Inachus⁸; referring

⁸ "Ανωθεν οὖν ἀπὸ Μωσέως συναγάγωμεν τὴν καθ' Ἑλληνας χρονογραφίαν ἀπὸ τῆς Μωσέως γενέσεως ἐπὶ τὴν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔξοδον ἔτη δρούγκοντα, καὶ τὰ μέχρι τῆς τελευτῆς αὐτοῦ ἀλλα τεσσαράκοντα. γίνεται ή ἐξοδος [ἥ] κατὰ Ἰναχον, πρὸ τῆς Σωθιακῆς περιόδου ἐξελθόντος ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου Μωσέως, ἐτεσι πρότερον τριακοσίοις τεσσαρακονταπέντε ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς [Μωσέως] στρατηγίας [καὶ] Ἰνάχου ἐπὶ τὸν [Δευκαλίωνος] κατα-

no doubt to the exodus of the Shepherds. From whom it was that Clement took this statement is not expressly mentioned by him; but he gives it in passing from the chronology of the Hebrews to that of the Greeks, and he names in the same passage no other Greek authorities but Thrasyllus and Eratosthenes. Most probably it was mediately from the last of these, to whom he presently after returns, after quoting one or two intervening statements from Thrasyllus; but ultimately it may rest on the authority of Manetho, and certainly it was not Clement's own, for it does not appear that either he or his immediate authority understood its true import, for he himself confounds the exodus of Inachus with that of Israel. Its rendering may be this: "The exodus in the time of Inachus took place before the Sothic period in which Moses departed from Egypt, being earlier by three hundred and forty-five years." There is no doubt an ambiguity; but the same apparently intentional ambiguity was found by Josephus in Manetho, between the Hyksos Shepherds and the Israelites⁹. The dates and com-

κλυσμὸν, [τὴν δευτέραν λέγω ἐπομβρίαν, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Φαέθοντος ἐμπρησμὸν, ἢ δὴ συμβαίνει κατὰ Κρότωπον,] γενεαὶ τεσταράκοντα (sic), ἀριθμοῦνται. εἰς μέντοι τὰ ἑκατὸν ἑπτη, τρεῖς ἐγκαταλέγονται γενεαί. Clem. Alex. "Strom." i. p. 335, ed. fol. Par. 1641. In Mueller's *Fragmenta Hist. Gr.* iii. 503, this passage is ascribed to Thrasyllus; and the reading *τεσταράκοντα*, where I have noted it, is altered to *τέσσαρες*, as in the Latin version, without any authority except arbitrary conjecture by way of amendment. Of the words bracketed by me in the extract as here given, the first (ἢ) is suggested as probably an omission to be supplied; the others as interpolations on the sense to be rejected, conveying only the gloss of the writers by whom and from whom it had been quoted, and notably showing Clement's own confused misunderstanding of the statement.

⁹ Josephus, "c. Apion." i. 14. 26. The ambiguity and hesitation

putations of time for Inachus and Moses, of which several are given in the same page of Clement, and afterwards in page 341, may serve to show how much mistake and confusion have been created by treating them as contemporaries. But the forty generations measured from Inachus in the passage as quoted in the note above, will reach back to one reckoning of the flood, not, as Clement supposes, of Deucalion, but of Noah, and will reasonably well agree with the placing of Inachus 345 years before Moses was born. That the Exodus of Israel did not take place in the time of Inachus, is expressly attested by the general concurrence of historians. "All the historians," says Syncellus, "both they of the circumcision and they of grace,—Josephus and Justus, Clement the sacred Miscellanist, and Tatian, and Africanus,—agree that Moses was born under Inachus, and flourished in the time of Phoroneus, son of Inachus and Niobe, and led the Exodus of Israel from Egypt in the time of Apis; adducing their proofs from the historical writers in repute among the Greeks¹." He mentions Eusebius as alone differing. But Syncellus is certainly in error in supposing that Moses was even *born* in the time of Inachus, and Eusebius was as certainly in the right when he wrote, "But let any one compute as he will, and he will find that in the time of Inachus, who they say was the first who reigned at Argos, lived the patriarch of the Hebrews, Israel; from whom the twelve tribes of the Jews have acquired the appella-

of Manetho will be found strongly illustrated in the second of the passages cited. The subject will be further noticed in the General Remarks in the tenth Chapter.

¹ Syncel. "Chronogr." ed. Dindorf, vol. i. p. 228.

tion of Israel ?” Taking the passage then in connexion with the other evidence, it is consistent with the fact that the golden circle was erected in the former half of the long reign of Sesostris the Great, just after his return from his conquests, and under his own direction : and that the year represented on it was in correspondence with his birth, or the commencement of his expeditions, or the summit of his glory, but not with the period of his death. From comparison with data furnished by Manetho, his return from his conquests appears to have been at the close of the forty-first year of his life, after which he reigned fifty-nine years, and his son sixty-six years, giving thus an interval of 125 years to the manifestation of God to Moses in the burning bush.

It is necessary before leaving this part of the subject, to observe, that, as our calculation for the period extending back from the year B.C. 911 has been made by the year of $365\frac{1}{4}$ days, afterwards called the Julian year (as it was also most probably by the exactly equivalent value of the year implied in the Canicular Cycle, that the Septuagint translators calculated to the same time), the date so arrived at is not that in which the Thoth of the Egyptian year would actually coincide with the autumnal equinox ; but an allowance must be made on account of the shorter measure of the true solar year, which would carry the date a quarter of a century further back, if we calculate by the measure

² “Verum utcumque quis volet, computet, et reperiet Inachi temporibus, quem primum Argis regnasse aiunt, patriarcham Hebraeorum fuisse Israëlem ; a quo duodecim Iudaeorum tribus Israëlis vocabulum sortitæ sunt.” Euseb. “Chron. Can.,” *Proæmium*, ap. Scalig. “Thesaur. Temp.” p. 54.

of the year used by Sir Isaac Newton. For it would take so many more solar than Julian years to make up, by the sum of their annual differences from the Egyptian year, the requisite retrogression of the Thoth of the latter. This, neglecting for the present another necessary correction, would conduct us to the autumnal equinox B.C. 1663, as the lowest limit, and would allow the range of other three years within the same quadrennial period, during which the equinox would occur on the same day, thus carrying on to B.C. 1666; which is one of two alternative dates apparently used by Manetho. The other alternative date used by him is B.C. 1670. The estimate of the solar year used by Newton is longer than the exact measure of it settled upon by astronomers in the present age³, and even longer, perhaps, than the true year in those ancient times. Nevertheless, the ancient scientific estimate of the solar year, used by the Egyptian astronomers and priests, was not shorter than that used by Sir Isaac, but longer, it seems, by fourteen seconds, as we shall find; and, therefore, Manetho could not by this process compute to a higher date than 1666. Yet he appears to have allowed himself the latitude of another quadrennial period; and if so, these additional four years involved in his alternative date, B.C. 1670, may need a different explanation. But, not to encumber ourselves at present with that minute inquiry, I simply give both these alternative dates of his; as it will be found that they are both necessary to the resolving of his chronology.

Suffice it here to observe, that if, at the first, the commencing day of Thoth was placed on the first day *after* the equinox, and the reckoning was

³ See above, p. 242, *note*.

taken thence, that would have the effect of bringing another quadrennial period into the computation. So simple and probable a circumstance might serve to carry the date of the legalized introduction of the Egyptian year in the calculation of Manetho back to the year B.C. 1670.

But these dates of his are only approximate; because, while the computation on which they are obtained corrects the error involved in the Julian measure of the year, and in the Canicular Cycle constructed in correspondence with it, it does not correct the error indicated as involved in the assumption that the equinoxes bisect the year. Reckoning back by the summer months through which the regression of the Thoth had passed, there were $3\frac{5}{6}$ days more than the exact half of the year; and these in the regression of the Thoth, at the rate of a day every four years, are equivalent to $15\frac{1}{3}$ years, which would carry the time back from B.C. 1670 into B.C. 1685. Manetho did not advert to nor correct that error; and therefore it was necessary for us to defer correcting it till his two approximate dates, above mentioned, had been noticed and compared with the computation, and their real coincidence with it shown.

But I must now ask my reader to consider a process by which I have obtained another limit, based not on the regression of the Thoth of the Egyptian year, but on the Canicular Cycle which was introduced in conjunction with that measure of the year. We shall then be able to compare the result thence obtained with those which we have just arrived at, as well as with Manetho's approximate date of the Canicular Cycle, and with another historical date of it from Tacitus; and it will be

shown that I have thence obtained a singular verification of the date of the philosophical introduction of the Egyptian year and Canicular Cycle, and of the observations on which these were based, as delineated on the golden circle. But first let me produce, both with a view to it, and in corroboration of what has been advanced, an incidental statement of the late Professor Robison, which has already been alluded to, as recognizing the knowledge of the true year by the ancient Chaldeans and Egyptians. "It is now very certain," says he, "that the precession of the equinoxes was known to the astronomers of India many ages before Hipparchus. It appears also that the Chaldeans had a pretty accurate knowledge of the year of seasons. From their Saros we deduce their measure of the year to be 365 days, 5 hours, 49 minutes, and 11 seconds, exceeding the truth by only 26 seconds⁴, and much more exact than the year of Hipparchus. They had also a sidereal year of 365 days, 6 hours, 11 minutes. Now what could occasion an attention to two years if they did not suppose the equinoxes movable? The Egyptians also had a knowledge of something equivalent to this: for they had discovered that the Dog-star was no longer the faithful forewarner of the overflowing of the Nile; and they combined him with the star Fomalhaset in their mystical calendar. This knowledge is also involved in the precepts of the Chinese philosophy much older than Hipparchus." Here then it stands confessed that they had made a considerable approach

⁴ Professor Robison seems here to have been taking the measure of the year at 365d. 5h. 48m. 45s., which is probably too short for that period, but is according to Lalande or Bailly. See above, p. 242, *note*.

to accuracy in regard to the length of the sidereal and solar years; that they estimated these respectively at nearly an equal distance from the mean measure of 365½ days; and that they took the solar to be a little nearer the Julian measure than it really is. Whatever was known to the astronomers of Chaldea, Egypt, or India, was known to them all under the dominancy and intercommunication of the parts of the same united empire. The approximate measure of 365½ days had been arrived at ages before, and was embodied in the old Canicular Cycle by Thoth; so that what was progress to the Romans, namely the adoption of the Julian measure, was as regards Egyptian and Chaldean science, much like reverting to the days of Osymandyas. A close approximation had in the interval been made to the discovery of the exact solar and sidereal years. There seems no reason to doubt that the Canicular Cycle, and the golden circle of the year placed in the tomb of Osymandyas, had been instrumental to this noble discovery. Nay, a calculation may be based on the excess of the difference of the solar and sidereal years, as estimated by them, over the exact truth, which may approximately conduct us to the very date of the astronomical observations on which the delineation of the Golden Circle was founded. From the above figures of Professor Robison, that difference appears to have been assumed by them at 21 minutes 49 seconds a year; being one minute, thirty-two seconds, and about nine-tenths of a second, in excess of the truth. Now this excess of their estimate of the annual difference of the two years must have arisen from *under-estimating* the number of years among which the aggregate divergence of